

Appendix A (ii)

Summary of priority 1 (People – Children) budget reduction proposals

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total
Title	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Reduce the number of agency staff	(196)	(61)	-	-	-	(257)
Reduce operational costs	(347)	(250)	-	-	-	(597)
Reduce the costs of placements	(746)	(90)	(90)	-	-	(926)
Safeguarding and Social Care and Early intervention and preventing demand	(290)	-	-	-	-	(290)
Increase income generation	(23)	-	-	-	-	(23)
People (Children) Totals	(1,602)	(401)	(90)	-	-	(2,093)

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PC1

Title of Option:	Reduce the number of agency staff		
Priority:	P1	Responsible Officer:	Director of Children’s Services
Affected Service(s):	Children in Need of Support and Protection and Children in Care, Quality Assurance, Early Help	Contact / Lead:	

Description of Option:
<p>Total savings for this proposal to reduce agency spend on social work staff are £257,000.</p> <p>The proposal is to reduce the number of social work agency staff through the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Retaining social work staff is key to reducing spend on agency staff. One way of doing this is to ensure that social workers have a varied learning and development programme that helps them maintain and develop their skills and that this is supported by clearly mapped out career progression opportunities. This proposal therefore includes the creation of 14 senior practitioner roles which will replace ordinary social worker posts and help with the retention of social workers who are looking for more senior roles with additional responsibilities. Full year savings will be £35,000. b) Growing our own social workers through the recruitment of newly qualified social workers is the second proposal. Newly qualified social workers looking for their first post are easier to recruit than more experienced social workers. In Haringey the support for this cohort is well established and headed by experienced staff members skilled in this area of work. Expanding this model will deliver savings, improve consistency of support and relationships for families and allow the organisation to “grow our own” talent. The proposal is to recruit at least ten newly qualified social workers each year and as they become more experienced and can take on a full case load of children we will release at least ten agency workers. Full year savings will be £101,000. c) Launching a digital recruitment strategy that clearly communicates the Haringey offer and is effective in attracting experienced social workers is key to reducing our agency staffing numbers. We also plan to review the Recruitment and Retention offer to ensure it continues to be effective and is targeted at the correct teams. The new offer will provide a more attractive offer to the hardest to recruit services. This could mean reducing the offer to those that are not difficult to recruit to, should evidence support this. Full year savings will be £121,000.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	196,000	61,000			

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?
Children will be able to build strong relationships with social workers as instability in a workforce can mean that children have many different social workers.
What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
Improved career progression opportunities for staff.
How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?
Meet statutory duties to ensure children are protected from harm and supported to maximise their life chances. Improves the skill and experience levels in the social care workforce which means statutory requirements should be more effectively met.

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Unable to recruit to full cohorts	H	M	Continuous recruitment campaigns with full support from management and recruitment partner
Turnover of staff increases	H	L	Turnover is reducing and key actions are being taken to ensure Haringey is a good place for social workers to develop and practice
Recruitment offer fails to attract experienced workers to key teams	H	M	The Recruitment and Retention offer will be kept under review and there is monthly monitoring of recruitment and retention and action will be taken to address any arising issues.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PC2

Title of Option:	Reduce operational costs		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	Director of Children’s Services
Affected Service(s):	Children in Need of Support and Protection and Children in Care, Quality Assurance, Early Help	Contact / Lead:	

Description of Option:
<p>This proposal sets out a number of proposed actions to reduce operational costs by £654K. These include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Review our approach to managing less complex children in need cases and those families needing immigration advice and support. This approach will involve de-designating vacant social worker posts where support to families can be delivered by family support workers in teams where child protection issues are not the main reason for support. Any assessments and visits will continue to be delivered by social workers as statutorily required. Full year savings will be £26,000. b) Reduce staffing costs where work has now been incorporated into central teams and a post is vacant. Full year savings will be £43,000. c) Reduce management costs where the posts are no longer needed as they have been vacant for some time and the operational management has changed. Full year savings will be £30,000. d) Reduce the costs of more complex cases in social care teams through the redesign and development of the early help teams. Full year savings will be £250,000. e) Reduce the costs of running the Children’s Centres through reducing the management costs. Full year savings will be £248,000. f) Introduce a new more flexible model of delivering support to gypsy and traveller children and families. This will include working closely with other services across the council and ensuring family support workers have specialist skills and can commission flexible advisory support when it is needed. Full year savings will be £57,000.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	347,000	250,000			

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?
Children and families will continue to receive the right help at the right time. Proposals above reflect best practice in other local authorities where safeguarding issues are dealt with through the MASH and in Safeguarding and Support teams. The proposals are low risk, and the impact to families is likely to be positive. For most families ongoing social care support is seldom required as families are able to care for their children appropriately. If there are issues of significant harm, child protection there is a pathway to stepping cases back up for a social work intervention.
What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
As significant number of the above proposals relate to already vacant posts there will be minimal impact on staff. Where staff are affected by changes they will be consulted on the proposed changes.
How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?
These options have no impact on the council meeting statutory duties to ensure children are protected from harm and supported to maximise their life chances. Social Workers must continue to complete an initial assessment of the family and their needs in accordance with s17 of the children’s act 1989 and this will be done in the assessment service.

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Capacity across the services could be reduced as vacant posts are deleted	M	L	Capacity will be monitored through performance measures and case loads and action will be taken if issues emerge
Commissioned services do not adequately meet the needs of communities	H	L	Contract management will ensure performance is closely monitored and feedback and complaints will inform this

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PC3

Title of Option:	Reduce the cost of placements		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	Director of Children’s Services
Affected Service(s):	Safeguarding and support, Looked after children, Young Adults Service, Special Education Needs and Disabilities	Contact / Lead:	

Description of Option:
Total savings for this proposal to reduce the costs of placements is £926,000.
The proposals include:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Increasing the recruitment and retention of in-house foster carers and reducing the use of independent foster carers. Savings for this proposal total £270,000 over a number of years. b) Commission respite care following the agreed closure of Haslemere. Full year savings will be £145,000. c) Enhance the brokerage teams to improve negotiation of packages and management of direct payments. Full year savings will be £75,000. d) Timely adaptation of properties for children with disabilities. Full year savings will be £175,000. e) Ensure that children with Special Education Needs and Disabilities placed in out-of-borough schools are receiving independent travel training to encourage independence where appropriate. Full year savings will be £125,000. f) Commission a range of supported housing services for young care leavers. Full year savings will be £136,000.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	746,000	90,000	90,000		

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?
A wider range of placements will be in place to ensure that children receive the right support at the right time.
What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
Local providers will have opportunities to develop services to provide placements for young people.
How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?
The council has a duty to ensure there are sufficient placements for children who need to be cared for and these proposals support this requirement.

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Unable to recruit sufficient foster carers and the loss of in-house carers due to retirement is greater than our ability to recruit	H	M	A strong recruitment campaign is in place and performance and numbers of carers are monitored monthly to address any issues that arise quickly
The care market is not developed enough and cannot respond to specifications to deliver placements	H	M	Work is in train to work with and support providers to develop their range of services

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PC4

Title of Option:	Safeguarding and Social Care and Early intervention preventing demand		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	Director of Children’s Services
Affected Service(s):	Children in Need of Support and Protection and Children in Care, Looked After Children, Early Help	Contact / Lead:	

Description of Option:

Total savings for this proposal are £290,000.

Haringey has 71 children per 10,000 (2017/18) who are looked after compared to 65.7 for statistical neighbours and 58 for inner London. This proposal aims to provide a programme of support for children at risk of entering into care and prevent young adolescents at risk from a range of issues such as crime, gangs and violence, sexual exploitation, exclusion and unemployment from achieving poor outcomes. These actions include:

- d)** Developing an effective edge of care service which means children and families will be safely supported to avoid entering care. This will include reviewing our family reunification approach where children in care and those are admitted into care under a section 20 arrangement and are then supported to safely return home. **Full year savings will be £150,000.**
- e)** Developing a vulnerable adolescents service which will identify vulnerable young adolescents and ensure they receive the right help at the right time to prevent poor outcomes for them and ensure they do not need more expensive social care services. **Full year savings will be £140,000.**

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	290,000	0			

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?
<p>The range, nature and causes of adolescent risk differ than those faced by younger children and there is increasing recognition that the system developed to protect children from harm is not well placed to meet the needs of adolescents. Young people who enter care at an older age tend to experience a number of placement moves; have poorer outcomes relating to education; are more likely to struggle when leaving care and are disproportionately more likely to go missing and be vulnerable to exploitation.</p> <p>The poor outcomes for young people who enter care and the need to reduce pressures on the placements budget provides a clear rationale for investing in the right interventions and approaches to prevent young people from entering care, whenever it is safe to do so.</p>
What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
<p>These models are evidencing varying levels of savings to the Council as well as more widely to the health and police.</p>
How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?
<p>The Council will continue to meet its statutory duties to protect children and young people from harm. The new approach will support young people where there is high degree of family conflict, experience of early trauma such as historic/current domestic abuse, parental substance misuse, parental mental health issues and young people have multiple vulnerabilities such as being excluded, at risk of offending, criminal and sexual exploitation, going missing and NEET.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Suitability of referrals to the services	M	M	Close working across various teams will be required to ensure that the right young people are referred to the service and that thresholds for the service are clear and clearly implemented
Adolescents or parents refuse to engage in the offer	H	M	Ensure staff have the skills to work effectively with parents and adolescents
Failure to meet the minimum threshold	M	M	These savings are based on a modest number of young people meeting the thresholds for service and work will begin in advance of the service launching to identify those that are suitable

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref:
PC5

Title of Option:	Increase income generation		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	Director of Children's Services
Affected Service(s):	Early Help	Contact / Lead:	

Description of Option:
Total savings for this proposal are £23,000.
This proposal is to increase income and contributions to services through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Providing Educational Psychology Services to schools b) Providing Advisory Teacher Services and training to schools

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	23	0			

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?
Schools will be able to request and buy additional support for children when they need it.
What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?
Educational Psychology staff will continue to deliver statutory services to children.

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Inability to recruit sufficient Education Psychology staff	H	M	Working with recruitment partner to ensure proactive recruitment to vacant roles

Priority Two – Budget Reductions

Summary of budget reduction proposals for Adults Services

		2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2023/24
Ref	Title	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
PA1	Charging for Managed Accounts	120	0	0	0	0	120
PA2	Fast tracking financial assessments	140	0	0	0	0	140
PA3	Capitalisation of CAS	177	0	0	0	0	177
PA4	Housing Related support	600	0	0	0	0	600
PA5	In-House Negotiator	116	344	0	0	0	460
PA6	Transfer of High Cost Day Opps	0	525	15	0	0	540
PA7	Public Health (Sexual Health)	267	0	0	0	0	267
PA8	Investment of drug and alcohol savings in preventative services for adults and families, targeting health inequalities	400	0	0	100	100	600
PA9	Further savings to be delivered by Adults Services	180	180	180	180	0	720
	People (Adults) Totals	2,000	1,049	195	280	100	3,624

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PA1

Title of Option:	Charging for Managed Accounts		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	John Everson
Affected Service(s):	Adults	Contact / Lead:	Farzad Fazilat

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Charging Administration Fee

- 1. Appointeeship** - Currently the Council does not charge for administration of Appointeeship clients, unlike Deputyship where there is an administration fee for managing client funds and assets. The full set of Deputyship charges are set out by the Court of Protection. There is no national policy governing charges for Appointeeship. Policy and charges are therefore subject to local Council decisions. Subject to review and potentially Cabinet approval, the Council may decide to charge an administration fee comparable to that levied for Deputyship, the additional income based on 200 new clients could equate to approximately £70k in additional annual income.
- 2. Self-funders** - A number of residents meet the full costs of their care and therefore arrange their own packages of care, without recourse to the local authority. However, some residents who meet the full costs of their care look to the Council to organise the setting up of their care packages – a function for which the Council does not currently charge. Other authorities do charge for this service. As an income-generating opportunity, the Council is proposing to charge for arranging packages of care for self-funders. Given only a minority of disabled and older residents in need of packages of care are self-funders, the income generating potential is limited and a maximum of £50k additional income has been calculated.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings (year on year)	120				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>1. Appointeeship – Those clients for whom the Council acts as Appointee would be impacted by this change as they would incur a management fee. This is in line with other administrative tasks carried out by the Council on behalf of users and would mirror the approach for Court of Protection clients, ensuring that the Council covers its administrative costs. Administrative costs would only be levied where there were sufficient funds in place to warrant this. Close communication with clients and families will be needed to ensure introduction of charges does not have an adverse impact on vulnerable clients.</p> <p>2. Self-funders - There will be a financial impact on those adults who fund their own care and who choose to have their care managed by the council. Currently this management service is free. Those who do not want to pay this fee would have the choice to manage their own care provision which may result in taking up poor quality services or placing stress on the individual.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>The Council is currently able to charge for Court of Protection clients based on legislative guidance. There is no such guidance for charging fees in relation to appointeeship although their situations are in effect similar.</p> <p>There would be additional administrative time required to manage the charging of this service.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>The Council is already meeting its statutory responsibility to appointeeship clients. As the number of clients increase, however, the council recognises the administrative costs of managing client accounts is increasing and that there is a need to off-set this increasing cost.</p> <p>The statutory requirement to provide care and support under the Care Act 2014 legislation is not affected by the proposal to charge self-funders.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There may be objections from clients and users about the proposal to charge for managing appointeeship accounts. The fact there is no specific statutory guidance around charging appointeeship clients may pose a barrier.			Legal and financial advice prior to implementation and develop breakdown of which clients will be subject to charging.
Self-Funders not managing their care effectively			All people in receipt of Adult Social Care receive a review. Any issues would be identified at this stage or if the service user or carer contacted the service.

Priority Two – Budget Reductions



Capacity of staff to deliver			A full appraisal will need to be carried out to ensure the application of charging does not incur additional costs.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PA2

Title of Option:	Fast Tracking Financial Assessments		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	John Everson
Affected Service(s):	Adults	Contact / Lead:	Farzad Fazilat

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

This proposal aims to speed up the process of financial assessment so that charging starts as soon after the start of services as possible. The aim would be to carry out any necessary financial assessment before services are brokered and put in place, except in an emergency. The saving lies largely in reducing levels of debt and the costs of recovering overpayments rather than any additional costs to the user of this approach.

The Financial Assessment Process currently starts after a service has been agreed. The delay in assessment results in direct loss of income for the council. The direct loss of income for 2017-18 was £140k. We are changing the process to bring the assessment upstream and complete the calculation and determine client contribution before the service starts to avoid loss of income to the council.

It is worth noting that there are additional non-cashable savings which are deemed to be significant: the avoidance of the costs of lengthy recovery of unpaid contributions and a reduction in queries from providers and families which take up resources within the social care adult services, payments and Brokerage service. The fast tracking of financial assessments will ensure that all assessments are carried out before care packages and funding are agreed and will avoid loss of income as outlined above.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings (year on year)	140				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Service users will be aware of the outcome of the financial assessment sooner and thereby be able to understand any charges they will be required to meet, including deciding to make plans to manage their own care.</p> <p>Users will be aware sooner of the costs of services which have been put in place, with greater clarity about the client’s contribution to the cost of care for people who receive care.</p> <p>Users may feel they are being charged more or that charging is playing a part in their assessment – this is not the case.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>There would be an additional requirement for two Financial Assessment Officers to manage the fast tracking of Financial Assessments. The process needs to be fully integrated with the front of the service. This process would need to be fully reviewed prior to implementation to test the capacity of the team to deliver and the cost effectiveness of the approach.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>The statutory requirement to provide care and support under the Care Act 2014 legislation is not affected by this proposal.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Risk that users and carers will disengage with the financial assessment process if carried out near the needs assessment, adding further delay	M	M	Ensure financial assessment is introduced sensitively, demonstrating the benefits to the users of compliance
Capacity of staff to deliver	M	M	<p>Currently the staffing arrangement and process of the referral from Social Care front of the service to the Financial Assessment service does not lend itself to efficient way of working. Financial Assessment Officers need to be working closely with the front of the service to provide Fast Track assessments and provide timely advice to service users.</p> <p>We require two financial Assessment Officers at PO1 grade at the cost of £86k. This is invest to save.</p> <p>This would be reviewed after 24 months.</p>

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PA3

Title of Option:	Community Alarms Service		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	John Everson
Affected Service(s):	Adults Social Care	Contact / Lead:	Jeni Plummer

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Haringey’s Community Alarms Service provides personal alarms, with a monitoring and response service, and a limited range of other assistive technology to residents. CAS clients include council social care clients, along with self-funders and HfH properties, such as sheltered accommodation. The cost of delivering the service to CAS clients is offset by contributions from clients who would not be eligible for council-funded care.

Because installation of a CAS solution can be considered the provision or adaptation of fixed assets for the benefit of our residents, there is scope within financial regulations to capitalise the majority of the operating and equipment costs of the CAS.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings (year on year)	177				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>N/A</p> <p>Customers would not be impacted by this change to the way the service is funded.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>This results in one post being deleted, however this proposal is already in operation with no negative impacts experienced. All parties involved have been notified.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>Subject to agreement that capitalisation of proposed CAS costs is in line with financial regulations, there are no changes to the Council's ability to meet statutory requirements.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
N/A			

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PA4

Title of Option:	Optimising transformational element of the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	Charlotte Pomery
Affected Service(s):	Adults	Contact / Lead:	Gill Taylor

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

In essence, ASC is funding housing advice and support which can be funded through the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant whilst we transform these services and create longer term, more sustainable funding routes over the next 3 years.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings (year on year)	600				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Services to users and carers will be positively affected by this proposal as it is based on a transformational approach which will create more sustainable routes to funding going forward.</p> <p>Users and carers will continue to benefit from a range of housing related support to better meet their needs to live independently in the community.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Positive impact of continuation of housing related support, and a recognition of its continued value.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>The statutory requirement to provide care and support under the Care Act 2014 legislation is not affected by this proposal. The Council's duties under the Homelessness Reduction Act are not affected by these proposals.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There is a risk that routes to sustainable funding for services which can meet need are not identified.	M	M	Focus on transformational activity and doing something different.
Risk of reduced take up of HRS services during any transitional period.	M	M	Continue to make the case for vulnerable residents to be supported in a myriad ways to maintain their tenancies.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PA5

Title of Option:	Care Negotiation activity of Adults Care Packages		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	John Everson
Affected Service(s):	Adults Social Care	Contact / Lead:	Farzad Fazilat

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

An interim care negotiator was recruited in March 18 to work with providers of residential care, semi-independent care and supported living settings across Adult Social Care. The care negotiator used their knowledge of the market and a care fund calculator approach to renegotiate care costs down with providers in relation to overcharging in relation to actual service user needs.

The table below shows that there are potentially savings of £8,858 per week, which could equate to £460,662 annually. It is recommended that 2 care negotiators are recruited on 1 year FTC at P04 with an on cost figure of up to £114k

Financial benefits analysis					
Saving / Cost <i>All savings / costs shown on an incremental basis</i>	2019/20 £000s	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s
A. Gross saving	230	230			
B. Revenue implementation cost (One Off Pressure)	-114	0			
C. Ongoing revenue cost	0	0			
D. Net Saving (A+B+C)	116	230	0	0	0
E. Saving(s) already included in MTFs 2018/23					
F. New net additional saving (D minus E)	116	230	0	0	0

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i>
N/A Customers will not be directly impacted, staff have managed impact to ensure seamless transition. Proposal is currently in operation.
What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff - improved confidence in engaging with users and their families regarding placements. • Members - improved satisfaction of service users and their families and partner organisations; Improved reputation of Haringey Council. • Provider - enhanced relationship with Brokerage team to ensure strengths based needs are at the centre of negotiations.
How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?
The Council will continue to meet its statutory requirements under the Care Act 2014 and the Children and Families Act 2014, both of which place emphasis on needs assessment, outcomes identification and support planning. Improved knowledge of negotiating care costs with providers supports early help, prevention and wellbeing, promoting independence and supports families to make informed decisions about the care and support needs.

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
N/A			

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PA6

Title of Option:	Day Opportunities – transfer of high cost out of borough placements into borough		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	John Everson
Affected Service(s):	Adults Social Care	Contact / Lead:	James Cuthbert

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

The Council has three ex-day centre premises that, with certain adaptations, could be leased to a local provider to support 15-20 of these high cost service users at reduced cost, and closer to their existing support networks.

This could yield £540,000 in savings in full year 2020/21, depending on:

- Which service users move to the new service
- The outcome of the procurement exercise
- The capacity of the service to support a higher number of service users by using the leased premises as a ‘hub’ to support more service users.

There will be a capital outlay requirement of approximately £177k and a £10-15k social work resource requirement to manage (on a 3-4 month basis), the transition/support planning process of moving service users from out of borough back into area.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings (year on year)	0	525			

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i>
Service users and families accessing out of area placements at high cost will be supported to access the new service in borough and involved in the co-design process to ensure the new service meets need. There may be negative perceptions about the change from families which will need a robust co-production process to overcome.
What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i>
Enabling service users in out of area arrangements to take up services in borough may have impacts on the viability of the out of area services. However, the impact of this would not be significant as there is a plural market in third sector and private sector day opportunities services, and the leasing of an in-borough day centre premises to a provider will further diversify our in-borough market to supplement any capacity loss out of area.
How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
None of the day centres will be suitable for the designated service user group	M	M	Feasibility and works to be conducted.
Savings will be lower than anticipated because the procurement process fails to identify more cost-effective alternatives	M	M	Full market engagement exercise required.
Savings will be lower than anticipated because the Council is unable to support high-cost service users to access in-borough arrangements	M	M	Extensive programme of engagement required, with input from SW resource.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PA7

Title of Option:	Sexual health projection.		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	Akeem Ogunyemi
Affected Service(s):	All	Contact / Lead:	Sarah Hart

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Proposal

Sexual Health has the largest allocation within the public health budget and is a high-risk budget in terms of variation, as it is primarily comprised of demand-led services. The council is legally bound to provide open access sexual health services. Many residents use services outside of Haringey. The proposal is to offer up savings based on the efficiencies already achieved and for this to form the baseline budget 2019-20. Beyond this growth in the need for a service will be absorbed by channel shift from high cost services to self-testing.

Background

Spiralling demand and high unit price led public health to develop a local step change program and be part of a London wide re-commissioning program. In 2017, public health reshaped its provision and went to tender for a local young people’s service, BME outreach service, healthy living pharmacies and GP services, plus a shared North Central London services. Channel shift to these services created MTFs savings. Further savings are likely to come in 2018 from new on line testing services and a fairer tariff in clinics outside of NCL.

Growth – there is some uncertainty in knowing what the growth in demand has been because the channel shift and the old systems of demand capture are very different. 3.5% growth has been factored in which counter balance 15%-30% channel shift to less expensive routes of service delivery.

Savings summary:

There will be a net recurrent saving of £267k from 2019/20 onwards

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Existing Budget	5,450	5,183	5,183	5,163	5,163
Proposed net expenditure after savings	5,183	5,183	5,183	5,163	5,163
Savings	267	0	0	0	0
New net additional savings (year on year)	0	0	0	0	0

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)

Customers- savings are the result of a transformation program that has been a gradual ‘step change’, moving at the pace of residents adapting to using different types of sexual health services – i.e. pharmacies, young people’s service, to on line kits. Ongoing savings are coming from Commissioners having re negotiated a new tariff for out of area providers.

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
List both positive and negative impacts.

We are not expecting any further changes to services.

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?

The savings outlined in this template are a result of a better than anticipated shift away from acute GUM services. This is a result of a transformation that has already been planned in sexual health services in Haringey, and has been through relevant governance and consultation, which have outlined the benefits and risks.

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Sexual health services are demand-led	H	M	Regular review and profiling of activity. Communications about new cost-effective ways of accessing services (e.g. home testing kits)

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PA8

Title of Option:	Drug and alcohol savings with contribution to preventative services for adults and families, targeting health inequalities		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	Sarah Hart/Will Maimaris
Affected Service(s):	Drugs and alcohol services	Contact / Lead:	Sarah Hart

Description of Option:

Investment of drug and alcohol savings in preventative services for adults and families, targeting health inequalities

Retendering of the three core substance misuse adult contracts has created savings, available from January 2019. Savings come from a market price adjustment on the recovery service. Also through taking the employment services out of the contract, now funded until 2020 by the Department of Work and Pensions Individual Placement Support pilot. The cabinet report on the re-tendering process stated in the finance comments that proposals would be developed on how these savings would be used for investment in areas to improve health and wellbeing. We propose that we split the savings between cashable savings and investments in preventative services that reduce health inequalities and have a medium term return on investment for the council.

Table 1 shows that there will be a recurrent net saving related to reduced commissioning costs across the three years of £400k. The remaining funding will be held back for investment in schemes which prevent ill health in adults and families and have a specific focus on health inequalities. For these services, business cases will be developed for consideration, with a need to show returns on investment by 2021-22 to the council.

	Year 1 2019-20	Year 2 2020-21	Year 3 2021-22	Year 4 2022-3	Year 3 2021-22
Direct savings from reduced commissioning costs	£400k (recurrent)	£0	£0	£0	£450k
Invest	£200k (recurrent) including £142k in year 1 only for existing planned investment in targeted lifestyle services for adults	£0	£0	£0	£250k
ROI return from adults or children's social care budgets	£0	£0	To be included in the business case aim for recurrent £100k net saving	To be included in the business case aim for £100k recurrent net saving	To be included in the business case £100k net saving

Table 1 the savings achieved from the investment in reduction of use of high cost services.

Haringey public health now have a strong track record in identifying ROI programs and producing savings, not from limiting access but shifting demand e.g. alcohol hospital liaison services, enhanced home detox and the sexual health transformation.

Public health have scoped a number of potential areas for ROI. By May 2019 public health could rank these in terms of ROI and provide a business case. Below are some of the areas we would like to explore – many of which have a focus on families, – we would look to also scope plans which specifically reduce demand on adult social care.

- **Program of Individual Placement Support (IPS).** The national IPS trials in substance misuse and mental health will show if there is sufficient ROI from IPS. The savings will come in employment spring boarding more residents successfully through a Council funded program, this could be substance misuse treatment or homeless services.
- **Pause.** This is a national program that tackles vulnerable women having multiple pregnancies, which end in repeated social care interventions. Intermediate savings would come from a reduction care proceeding.
- **Program for children of dependent parents.** If Haringey is not successful in the innovation fund bid then we could fund the project with the savings. The ROI is potentially rapid on this project in terms of children’s social care costs and a future return on adult substance misuse budgets

Public health would work with finance to create a business case for any investment by May 2019 with a clear outline of where savings would be realised (adults vs childrens)

Why would the Council agree to invest to save rather than disinvestment? This option has two advantages for the Council, firstly being able to demonstrate investment in innovative prevention programs. Secondly, by exploring a small investment in years 1 and 2 public health deliver can potentially deliver savings in high cost social care budgets that will create a permanent shift in spend.

Funding for substance misuse services comes from the ring fenced public health grant, a return for which has to be provided to Public Health England (PHE) annually. Whilst recognising localism, there is significant scrutiny by PHE on substance misuse spend and wider public health spend and performance so any disinvestment would be questioned.

Summary of net savings:

- Year 1: 2019/20 - £400k net recurrent savings from commissioning costs**
- Year 3: 2021/22 – Additional £100k recurrent savings from return on investments – e.g. reductions in looked after children, reduction in adult social care costs.**
- Year 4: 2022/23 – Additional £100k recurrent savings from return on investment**

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Existing Budget	4,300	0	0	0	0
Proposed net expenditure after savings	3,900	0	0	0	0
Savings	400	0	0	0	0
New net additional savings (year on year)	400	0	0	100	100

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?
List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant

Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)

Commissioning savings have already been realised with the expectation that outcomes will not be negatively impacted.

The impact of new investments would be scoped and evaluated including an EqlA but would be targeted at reducing health inequalities

Potential positive contributions to the following borough plan outcomes:

Outcome 5: Happy childhood: all children across the borough will be happy and healthy as they grow up, feeling safe and secure in their family and in our community

Outcome 8: All adults are able to live healthy and fulfilling lives, with dignity, staying active and connected in their communities

a) Healthy life expectancy will increase across the borough, improving outcomes for all communities

c) Adults will feel physically and mentally healthy and well

d) Adults with multiple and complex needs will be supported to achieve improved outcomes through a coordinated partnership approach

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?

Commissioning savings have already been realised with the expectation that outcomes will not be negatively impacted. This has already been through cabinet in October 2018.

The impact of new investments would be scoped and evaluated and we would engage with partners on any proposals.

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?

Provision of drugs and alcohol support services are a condition of the Council's Public Health Grant. These will be continue to be delivered.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?

Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Commissioning savings	I	I	There will be a robust service user led process to ensure that the changes in delivery do not impact negatively on service users. The Commissioner will monitor the implementation of the new contract on a monthly basis. The service user network will help to support and service users through the transition to the new service
Return on Investment	TBD	TBD	

Summary of Priority 3 (Place) budget reduction

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total
Title	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO	-	400	-	-	-	400
Review and Extension of CPZ coverage	500	-	-	-	-	500
Waste, CS & Enforcement: Efficiency Savings on Veolia Contract	100	-	-	-	-	100
Increase in Moving Traffic Enforcement	260	40	-	-	-	300
Healthmatic Toilets	30	-	-	-	-	30
Extending parking enforcement	350	-	-	-	-	350
Litter Enforcement	-	100	-	-	-	100
Soft FM Efficiency	25	25	50	-	-	100
Leisure centre concessions	-	-	50	70	70	190
London Construction Programme Revenue	200	-	-	-	-	200
Flexible Police Resourcing	200	-	-	-	-	200
Waste Service Programme	-	500	-	-	-	500
Parking Transformation Programme	-	500	500	-	-	1,000
Place Totals	1,665	1,565	600	70	70	3,970

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL1

Title of Option:	Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Lynn Sellar
Affected Service(s):	Community Safety & Enforcement	Contact / Lead:	Lynn Sellar

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation is a Mandatory Function. Owners of eligible properties have to pay a fee of £208 per habitable unit to licence with the local authority.

As of April 2018 the definition of a Mandatory HMO has changed and now includes properties regardless of the number of storeys. This will expand the number of properties within our borough which will require licensing as previously they would have fallen outside this definition. This scheme became operational as of 1st October 2018.

Licensing of Mandatory HMO accommodation is a statutory function within Housing Act 2004.

The licensing of smaller HMO accommodation is a discretionary power that Haringey has adopted the use of. Additional HMO licensing exists within 5 wards of Tottenham and will end in May 2019.

Plans to extend Additional HMO Licensing across the borough and introduce selective licensing is proposed in 29 hot spots. The aim is to have both schemes in place by the end of 2019-20. These schemes have a 5 year lifetime and can be renewed at the end of this period.

HMO Licensing includes the inspection of property to ensure that it meets all legal standards. The aim of licensing is to improve living conditions for those tenants residing within this property type and to reduce the impact that this type of property can have on the local community.

Where it is a legal requirement of the property owner to licence, the onus is on the landlord or managing agent to ensure they fulfil their legal obligation. The aim of HMO Licensing in Haringey is to ensure that this property type is safe and well maintained for the tenants living within it. The property will be inspected for standards based on risk. Any property failing to meet standards will be prosecuted as per the legislation pertaining to this. Properties which are found to have failed to licence will be enforced against.

Additional fee income will be used to cover the costs of related services.

Mitigation to avoid negative consequences of the HMO licensing scheme

Through Migration Impact Funding (MIF) we are seeking to recruit 3 housing needs advisors who will sit within the Housing Improvement Team (HIT) and work alongside HMO Licensing officers and well as Homes for Haringey housing needs advisors. The aim of their role is to provide early intervention in cases where there may be displacement following our interventions or cases of tenants being negatively affected by their living conditions. Advisors will ensure that tenants understand their responsibilities as well as those of the landlord. This intervention aims to reduce landlords' use of section 21 eviction powers to evict tenants.

2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings		400			

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?
List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)

POSITIVE IMPACTS

Positive impact for tenants who reside in poorly maintained /managed HMO accommodation.

Properties found to be in use without a licence can have Rent Re-Payment Orders (RRO) placed on them if prosecuted and found guilty. The tenant can take his or her own RRO claim. Tenants are also protected from sec 21 housing evictions.

Those living in the local community should be positively impacted if they live in an area where this property type is not managed effectively. Licence conditions last for 5 year period, so landlords remain responsible for this duration.

Licensing produces a register of licence holders who have to be fit and proper persons. This allows tenants and Haringey officers to have direct contact details of the person they need to contact if things are failing.

Landlords and letting agents can advertise their properties as being licensed with the council, as a means of showing they meet standards and are compliant, good landlords in our borough.

NEGATIVE IMPACTS

Landlords have to pay a licence fee, although this is not burdensome with the average cost equating to £4 per week based on a 5 room HMO. That is 80p per week per tenant.

Some landlords have claimed to pass this cost on to tenants so tenants are concerned their rents will rise.

Mitigation/management – Landlords can claim this expense back from Inland revenue.

Landlord has to meet conditions and have works done to the property to meet statutory requirement.

Mitigation/management – Licensing conditions only ask for what is already a legal requirement for HMO accommodation. If they do not have these elements already then they have always been non-compliant.

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?

List both positive and negative impacts.

Positive Impact.

Makes identifying responsible owners of property easier for staff as there is a register of their contact details.

Provides a database of known HMO accommodation for the borough

Greater joining up of resources and service delivery.

Negative Impacts.

Increase in workload for officers in Housing improvement Team and other services.

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?

Licensing is a statutory function which supports the other statutory functions around enforcement response, fly tipping, noise and anti-social behaviour.

Properties are often identified through licensing that do not have planning permission, or which are failing to declare habitable units to Council Tax.

Licensing and early intervention will assist with the Homelessness Reduction Act and the impact of identifying non-compliance within HMO accommodation and the impact this can have on evictions etc.

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Extension to Licensing will not be agreed by cabinet	H	L	New Cabinet administration fully advised on its advantages.

<p>Landlords fail to license upfront, consequence is fee income will be stunted</p>	<p>H</p>	<p>M</p>	<p>Offer early bird, discount incentive to landlords who licence early.</p> <p>Prosecutions early on against those who have failed to licence to show that it is not an option to be tolerated.</p>
<p>Fail to recruit adequately trained officers to carry out HMO Licensing Function.</p>	<p>H</p>	<p>M</p>	<p>Re-examine delivery structure, look at alternative means of employment type/background, re-negotiate starting salaries to reflect competitive market in this area.</p>

DRAFT

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL2

Title of Option:	Review and extension of CPZ coverage		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Ann Cunningham
Affected Service(s):	Operations	Contact / Lead:	Ann Cunningham

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

This is an invest to save bid.

At present approximately 80% of the borough is subject to parking controls. Those controls not only ensure road safety and the free flow of traffic, but support the delivery of Borough Plan objectives as well as the Transport Strategy objectives. The parking account also delivers an annual surplus of approximately £10m, which is ring-fenced for spending on transport-related services.

There is an increasing demand for parking controls as residents struggle to park near their home, with many areas waiting years for measures to be implemented. Additional pressures arise this year due to the opening of the new Spurs Stadium.

This increased demand exceeds what we can deliver annually through current funding levels. In addition, our incremental approach generates further displacement, resulting in new pressures arising in other roads, and new demands for interventions.

We therefore propose an accelerated programme this year to ‘catch up’, which will allow us to deliver to resident and Member expectations, make appropriate provision for running costs, dealing with current budget gaps, while generating a surplus. This will require an additional £495k capital, with revenue generated next year. This business case sets out the proposed programme, and expected income levels.

CPZ – Background Statistics

- Full existing CPZ coverage - 741 streets
- 8 New Schemes – 99 streets (13% increased coverage)
- 12 Review Schemes – incl. disabled bays and waiting and loading bays
- Reactive Maintenance – Lines and Signs to enable enforcement

Model Assumptions – revenue costs from Year 2

For illustration purposes the business case presents a straight line model that averages out the expected income evenly over a 10 year period. It is likely that enforcement contraventions are at their highest in earlier years, with an expected increase in compliance in later years.

The business case sets out the total capital cost of £795k, the required capital funding is £495k, the service will fund £300k from its existing parking plan capital budget.

The revenue costs (year 3 onwards) required to sustain the operation is £500k per year that will be funded from the projected income (Permits and PCN) of £1m per year, giving a net projected income over expenditure of £500k.

The business case model illustrates a payback period of 2 years - income over expenditure £73k. Subsequent years (year 3 onwards) income over expenditure of £500k.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	500				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>This will ensure that the Council meets its obligations in terms of enforcing the parking restrictions and will make roads safer for all.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>This proposal will offer a more robust parking enforcement offer, supporting Businesses and residents.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>This growth in enforcement will help the Council meet its statutory obligations in terms of managing the road network. It will support the delivery of P3 and transport strategy objectives.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There are difficulties in recruiting Civil Enforcement officers at present.	H	L	We will work with Recruitment to make the offer look attractive and encouraged interest in working with us. We will also start the recruitment process early allowing for any delays in attracting suitable candidates.

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PL3

Title of Option:	Waste, CS & Enforcement: Efficiency Savings on Veolia Contract		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Stephen McDonnell
Affected Service(s):	Waste	Contact / Lead:	Ian Kershaw

<p>Description of Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>What is the proposal in essence? What is its scope? What will change?</i> - <i>What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)</i> - How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements? - <i>How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?</i> <p><i>[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]</i></p>
<p>These are efficiency savings secured in recent contract negotiations with Veolia. They will be delivered with no impact on services or performance. National legislation has meant the contractor is unable to meet recycling targets. This efficiency has been negotiated with the contractor. The contractor will make payments to offset the shortfall in targets and increased disposal costs.</p> <p><i>There is no further impact on Council objectives.</i></p> <p>Recycling collection is part of the wider integrated waste management contract with Veolia. The overall contract value is approximately £17m. Waste collection (including fortnightly residual and weekly recycling and food waste amounts to approximately £7m of that cost.</p> <p>Although these savings are associated with the recycling rate they will not be impacted by other measures. They reflect the contractor's inability to meet the recycling targets set at the outset of the contract. The contract still retains financial penalties for failure to meet recycling targets. If the contractor improves performance by lower disposal costs. If performance falls there will be increased penalties.</p> <p>There are no specific existing savings associated with the recycling collection however there are savings associated with the wider waste contract largely around charged services.</p> <p>Net New Savings - £100k in first year</p>

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	100				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
None
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
None
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
No impact.

Risks and Mitigation	
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>	
Risk	Mitigation
These savings are dependent on the current contractual arrangement with Veolia. Change of supplier would likely lose these savings.	Ensure any new contract or delivery takes account of these savings in baseline costs.
Savings will cease entirely at the end of our contract with Veolia in 2024/25.	

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL4

Title of Option:	Increase in Moving Traffic Enforcement		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Ann Cunningham
Affected Service(s):	Parking and Traffic Enforcement	Contact / Lead:	Ann Cunningham

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

The parking and traffic enforcement service enforces moving traffic contraventions at a number of locations. This project proposes the relocation of some existing unattended cameras to locations requiring enforcement, as well as introducing additional cameras at a new location.

It has been identified that the junction of Wood Green High Rd / Station N22 would benefit from the implementation of a yellow box junction, to aid vehicular movement as well as reducing road casualties. This will require the installation of 3 CCTV cameras, due to the layout of the junction, as well as the yellow box markings.

It is estimated through surveys previously undertaken that in the region of 5,800 PCNs would be issued at the proposed new locations, generating in the region of £300k in fines. This additional income will need to be ring fenced to fund transport related services, for instance contributing to concessionary travel costs.

One off Growth Required: £40k Capital 2019/20

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	260	40			

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Those proposals will aid road safety and support the delivery of corporate priorities and Transport strategy objectives.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Fewer casualties and improved flow of traffic</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>Yes. It supports our road network management and road safety obligations.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Surveys undertaken a while ago indicated levels of contraventions and driver behaviour may have changed.	H	L	Monitoring and evaluation
Resource levels and demands may influence delivery timescales.	H	L	Scheduling of works.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL5

Title of Option:	Waste, CS & Enforcement: Removal of Healthmatic Public Toilets		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Stephen McDonnell
Affected Service(s):	Waste	Contact / Lead:	Ian Kershaw

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Removal of two automated WCs (one near Finsbury Park, one on Wood Green High Road) and direction of customers to alternatives local facilities.

The toilets are poorly used, unattractive and there are alternative facilities of a higher standard nearby.

Removal may be perceived by some as an improved look to the streetscene. Others may see withdrawal as a loss.

Pavements will need 'making good' and utilities capping after removal which would require a one-off capital outlay.

In 2017 the Wood Green facility was visited 1185 times and the Finsbury Park facility 4603 times. This equates to approximately £5 per use. For the Finsbury Park facility, peaks occurred when major events were taking place in the park, when numerous other toilets are also available and supplied at the expense of the event provider.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	30				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Most customers will likely perceive this as an improvement on the streetscene. Some customers may need signing/directing to alternative provision.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Most customers will likely perceive this as an improvement on the streetscene. Some customers may need signing/directing to alternative provision.</p> <p>No discussions have taken place with other stakeholders. The Wood Green BID should be consulted on the withdrawal of the Wood Green High Road automated convenience.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>No impact on statutory requirements.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Some customers may see this as a withdrawal of a service particularly for those more vulnerable/elderly	L	L	Signposting to alternative provision and promotion of community toilet scheme

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL6

Title of Option:	Extending parking enforcement		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Ann Cunningham
Affected Service(s):	Parking and Traffic Enforcement	Contact / Lead:	Ann Cunningham

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

This is an invest to save bid.

The parking enforcement operation consists of two enforcement streams; on-street and car parks, and CCTV enforcement. This involves an establishment of 60 on-street CEOs and 13 CCTV operators plus management structures.

Changes to regulations in 2014 significantly reduced the enforcement of on-street parking restrictions by CCTV cameras. This enforcement reverted to the on-street operations, without resources increasing.

Over the past two years year we also rolled out 8 new CPZs, without increasing enforcement capacity. We now need to increase staff numbers to provide an adequate enforcement service and deal with the growing demand in North Tottenham.

See also proposal PL2 – Review and Extension of CPZ coverage

This will involve a one off capital allocation for handheld devices and other essential equipment. Any additional income will need to be ring fenced to fund transport related services, for instance contributing to concessionary travel costs.

One off Growth Required: £450k Revenue in 2019/20; £40k Capital in 2019/20.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Savings	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>					
New net additional savings	-350				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
--

<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>This will ensure that the Council meets its obligations in terms of enforcing the parking restrictions and will make roads safer for all.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>This proposal will offer a more robust parking enforcement offer, supporting Businesses and residents.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>This growth in enforcement will help the Council meet its statutory obligations in terms of managing the road network. It will support the delivery of P3 and transport strategy objectives.</p>

Risks and Mitigation <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There are difficulties in recruiting Civil Enforcement officers at present.	H	L	We will work with Recruitment to make the offer look attractive and encouraged interest in working with us. We will also start the recruitment process early allowing for any delays in attracting suitable candidates.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL7

Title of Option:	Litter Enforcement		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Stephen McDonnell
Affected Service(s):	Community Safety	Contact / Lead:	Sarah Tullett

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

We need to have effective enforcement strategies to help keep the borough clean and safe. This proposal is to consider the option for in-house service provision based on the pilot we ran with an external contractor, Kingdom, from November 2016 to September 2017.

The proposal is dependent on a £300K growth bid to generate fines (FPNs) which have been estimated at around £400K. This calculation is based on a model which assumes a mixture of FPNs being issued for street litter and fly tipping. Also to act as a deterrent it is proposed that the FPN level increase from £80 to £180.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	2019/20 £000s	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s
New net additional savings		100			

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?
List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)

Perception of how safe a neighbourhood is can be negatively affected by low level anti-social behaviour such as fly tipping and littering. It also has a negative impact on the economic growth and regeneration of an area.

Litter enforcement will assist in the delivery of a cleaner borough that residents would be proud to live in and work in.

Some customers will welcome increased enforcement while others may perceive it negatively.

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
List both positive and negative impacts.

A high profile litter enforcement team will play a key role, alongside education, in behaviour change - raising the profile of littering as an anti-social behaviour and increasing the perception of risk to those who drop litter.

Increase in fines and noticeable enforcement presence should have a deterrent effect.
How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?
No direct impact however an effective enforcement service is necessary to help us meet our responsibilities under the Environmental Protection Act and other legislation.

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Additional back office costs in relation to legal services and debt management	M	M	To ensure that all associated cost are taken in to consideration as part of a fuller options appraisal
High staff turnover	M	H	Working terms and conditions and sufficiently generous remuneration should encourage staff retention
A self-funding service would be dependent on targeting specific offences notably dropping cigarette butts. This may seem trivial to some.	M	M	Clear communication about the value we place on clean public places and the harm that can be generated from smoking as well as the greater tendency for litter to proliferate where some litter types are tolerated.
A self-funding service is dependent on residents and visitors breaching rules. A successful service may drive behaviour change undermining its ability to fund itself.	L	H	Clear specification of the service, including the prospect that a truly successful service must be measured by outcomes in terms of street cleanliness.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL8

Title of Option:	Corporate Contracts: Soft FM Efficiency Savings		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Stephen McDonnell
Affected Service(s):	Corporate Contracts	Contact / Lead:	Darren Butterfield

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

New Haringey commissioning officer will work with Amey Account manager and required internal and external parties to carry out a review and Re-commission of the soft FM services, and services delivered through Amey contract (e.g. efficiencies in postage, front of house, security, cleaning etc).

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	25	25	50		

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
--

<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>There should be no negative impact on customers, efficiently on savings and processes to be achieved should have a positive impact.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>The review of the various soft services will be carried out and various partners, stakeholders, staff , unions etc will be involved throughout the process.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>No impact on Statutory requirements.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
No current risk identified at the moment.			

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL9

Title of Option:	Review of Leisure Centre Concessions		
Priority:	Place/People	Responsible Officer:	Stephen McDonnell
Affected Service(s):	Leisure Centres	Contact / Lead:	Andrea Keeble

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

The Council’s contract with Fusion for the management of the three leisure centres includes a council-designed concessionary pricing scheme. The council retain control of the charges that can be levied by Fusion as part of the concessionary scheme. Generally they are only put up by CPI inflation each year.

The current schemes permits free access to residents over 65 Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm.

In addition those residents who are Under 16, Over 60, Students, those on various DWP Benefits, and Haringey Carers receive the first level of Advantage + discount.

Those residents on Income Support / Universal Credit / Housing Benefit / Council Tax Benefit, Income based Job Seekers or Working Tax Credit receive a higher level of Advantage discount.

The level of discount depends on the activity but a couple of key activities such as a casual swim or a casual gym session the pricing is as follows:-

Item	Standard Price	Advantage +	Advantage
Indoor Casual Swim	£4.95	£2.35	£1.70
Casual Gym	£8.00	£5.65	£2.85

Since 2008 leisure centre activity pricing has been based on people’s ability to pay. Those that are able to pay the full commercial rate are asked to do so, and others that need support in accessing the leisure facilities receive a subsidised rate. The leisure centre subsidy is an average annual sum of £435,000.

Further work needs to be carried out to research, design and quantify the impact of any changes to the concessionary pricing system, but a key outcome will be to simplify a future scheme.

1. Financial benefits summary					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings			50	70	70

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> <p>Reviewing the system of concessionary pricing in the leisure centres would ensure it is still fit for purpose. A reviewed system would ensure that target groups are helped to access the leisure centre where price is a barrier.</p> <p>A reviewed system would ensure that users who can afford to pay are asked to pay.</p> <p>A reviewed system could respond to the increase in the state pension age and recoup fees from a cohort of users who may well be able to pay.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to simplify the system for all users.</p> <p>However, in some instances, a change in pricing could reduce people’s use of leisure centres.</p> <p>There are strong links to the People priority of the Borough Plan.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> <p>The success of this proposal will require a renegotiation of the management contract.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> <p>No statutory implications</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
People dropping out of exercise impacting their long term health.	M	M	Retain a concessionary scheme that targets those most in need of support. Engage with leisure centre users from the outset

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL10

Title of Option:	LCP Revenue		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Barry Phelps
Affected Service(s):	LCP	Contact / Lead:	Barry Phelps

Description of Option:
 The London Construction Programme (LCP) is a virtual organisation managed by the Head of Procurement in Haringey. The LCP provide a suite of pan London construction related frameworks that are accessible by Public Sector organisations.

Towards the end of 2018/19 the LCP will establish a new pan London Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) in partnership with Construction line. The DPS will be for the provision of construction related professional services and minor works.

The DPS will generate revenue through a subscription. There are currently 43 LCP members. It is anticipated at least 50% of the current LCP membership will access the DPS. Subscriptions range between £15k and £25k per member depending upon how many DPS categories they access. Assuming 50% of LCP members subscribe at the mid-point, this will generate £440k of revenue per annum effective 2019/20.

Taking into account additional operational costs associated with the DPS and other resources in Strategic Procurement, it is anticipated there will be an annual surplus of £200k.

Existing Budget	-100				
Proposed net expenditure after savings	-300				
Savings	200	0	0	0	0
New net additional savings (year on year)	200				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i>
N/A Customers will not be directly impacted.
What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i>
DPS will increase SME interaction and enhance localism throughout London
How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?
Provides a compliant route to market for procurement activity in this sector

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Demand for service changes unexpectedly	M	L	At present, research has shown that there isn't another organisation that provides access to a professional services DPS platform which covers the categories we are proposing. Quick mobilisation of the team will enable access to the market against only a small number of competitors.
Lack of appetite amongst LCP members for professional services DPS platform	H	L	Pre-market engagement has indicated this is a low risk with 80% of LCP members interested. Increase in the marketing strategy through the existing LCP MW 2014 framework agreement. Due to the natural correlation between the MW 2014 framework and the proposed DPS platform it would be more effective to re-energising the client base.
Reputational risk if the project is not considered a success within Haringey and amongst the existing LCP client base	H	L	Haringey have learned from several DPS implementations, adequate resource, project governance, realistic project timescales and detailed scoping are key activities to ensure a successful implementation. It is proposed to use the newly established DPS team to project manage the implementation of the DPS alongside the LCP.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL11

Title of Option:	Flexible Police resources		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Eubert Malcolm
Affected Service(s):	Community Safety	Contact / Lead:	Eubert Malcolm

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

This proposal is to cease funding for the police partnership team.

The police partnership team consists of 1 sergeant and 5 PCs.

The funding for the team enables the tasking of police officers along with the wider partnership i.e. trading standards, CCTV, ASB enforcement to hotspots in the borough.

The current contract runs up to March 2019.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	2019/20 £000s	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s
New net additional savings	200				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>The main negative impact will be on Priority 3 - A clean, well maintained and safe borough where people are proud to live and work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced capacity to task officers to tackle ASB and criminality • Reduced capacity to work in partnership to tackle localised issues i.e. targeted joint enforcement activity, unauthorised occupation on council owned land and estates
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Removing this funding will reduce the ability to have sustainable impact on issues that blight the borough.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>This is no statutory duty to have these police officers working with the local authority</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Reduced capacity to deal with localised ASB concerns	H	M	Concerns will be passed to local SNT's
Reputational damage from the community following increased criminality	H	M	Concerns will be passed to local SNT's
Reputational damage with police colleagues from reducing the team	M	M	To discuss with the Borough commander before withdrawal

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL12

Title of Option:	Waste Services Transformation		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Stephen McDonnell
Affected Service(s):	Community Safety	Contact / Lead:	Ian Kershaw

<p>Description of Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>What is the proposal in essence? What is its scope? What will change?</i> - <i>What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)</i> - How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements? - <i>How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?</i> <p><i>[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]</i></p> <p>This savings proposal has been developed following independent advice from waste consultants Eunomia. Eunomia reviewed the viability and risks associated with a set of potential waste savings and assessed that on their own, each proposal had risks for deliverability and interdependencies with other services.</p> <p>An alternative approach as proposed by this submission, is to review all the waste and street cleansing services together as a new Transformation Programme. This will form a revised programme of work which will deliver greater savings from 2020/21 onwards.</p> <p>Over the next four months a detailed programme of work will be developed to inform viable models of waste collection and street cleansing that could deliver significant savings from 2020/21. By providing a robust review of our collection systems, the project should also deliver increased recycling, minimise the impact on disposal costs and reduce fly-tipping.</p> <p>A figure of £500,000 in savings from 2020/21 has been put forward as this revised MTFs option. This is derived from assessments made by Eunomia but will be informed by the detailed audit, mapping and modelling and ultimately Member decisions about new delivery models.</p>
--

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	0	500			

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i>
Waste collection is a universal service delivered to all homes in the borough, and so any changes are highly susceptible to negative impacts on satisfaction. Furthermore, the design of waste collection is key to recycling which impacts both cost and sustainability. Street cleansing is experienced by all residents and changes can impact satisfaction. To mitigate adverse effects any changes should be supported by small scale trials to make explicit the benefits and allow mitigation of any adverse effects.
What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i>
As above. A full EqIA and consultation will be needed before full scale changes are implemented.
How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?
Waste collection is a statutory function.

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Impact on recycling rate	M	M	Full service review will aim to minimise impact on recycling rate and some options may be available to increase it. This will be assessed as part of all the options developed for members.
Impact on waste disposal costs	M	M	Full service review will aim to minimise impact on waste disposal costs, and this will be assessed as part of all the options developed for members.
Impact on street cleanliness	M	M	Full service review will aim to minimise impact on street cleanliness, and align resources better to achieve the same outcomes across the borough.
Impact on resident satisfaction with the above services, and more widely, of the Council	M	M	All service changes will be subject to resident consultation and will need to be supported by an effective communications campaign.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL13

Title of Option:	Parking Transformation Programme		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Stephen McDonnell
Affected Service(s):	Parking	Contact / Lead:	David Murray / Ann Cunningham

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

The Parking Transformation Programme will deliver significant improvements to this service over the coming three years. A number of work streams are being developed, including the financial appraisals.

Proposed Savings

Activity	Revenue Expenditure	Income	Net Savings	2020-2021	2021-2022	Total
CPZ Review and Expansion Phase 3	£500,000	(£1,000,000)	(£500,000)	(£500,000)		(£500,000)
Pricing and Permits - Diesel Surcharge	£0	(£500,000)	(£500,000)		(£500,000)	(£500,000)
Total	£500,000	(£1,500,000)	(£1,000,000)	(£500,000)	(£500,000)	(£1,000,000)

CPZ Review and Expansion – phase 3

This will continue the CPZ rollout programme taking the borough to 100% coverage. Demand for CPZs is high and those controls support the delivery of transport and air quality strategies, as the delivery of new Borough Plan priorities.

Pricing and Permits - Diesel Surcharge

The Council adopted a parking permit charging policy based on CO2 emissions a number of years ago, encouraging the use of more fuel efficient vehicles. Many boroughs are now extended their charging models to tackle emissions from Diesel vehicles. It is proposed that Haringey also does so, which will complement a range of other measures to improve air quality across the borough.

Any additional income will need to be ring fenced to fund transport related services, for instance contributing to concessionary travel costs.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	0	500	500		

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>CPZs improve road conditions making them safe, improve air quality by reducing congestion and as such there no negative impacts.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Parking provisions will be made for Businesses.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>The Council has a statutory duty to manage the road network.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
The CPZ programme is subject to consultation and the community may reject proposals.	H	L	Consultation will be undertaken
The introduction of a Diesel surcharge is subject to consultation and the community may not support its introduction	H	M	Consultation will be undertaken

Priority Four – Budget Reductions

Summary of Budget Reduction Proposals – Economy/Regeneration

Economy				All Years	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Ref	Title	Category	Description	Net Saving (All)	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings
				£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
EC1	Carbon Management	Other	Saving £60k from the Carbon Management Service’s base budget, replacing this with an income of the same amount from Planning Service. The Carbon Management Service will increase its support to the Planning Service through advice and technical specification on planning applications and issues related to carbon reduction, energy and sustainability.	(60)	(60)	-	-	-	-
EC2	Reduction in consultancy budget	Other	Saving £75k from central budget typically allocated to cover large contracts and project delivery requirements. As some Tottenham Regeneration activities shift from a focus on initial strategies and feasibility work to delivery stage, there is increasing scope to explore funding these types of contracts from other sources, including but not limited to capitalisation of costs, utilising both internal and external funding sources.	(75)	(75)	-	-	-	-
EC3	Deletion of senior post	Efficiency Saving	The Strategic Director of Regeneration, Planning & Development was re-designated as Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, and along with this, it was proposed to delete the Director of Regeneration post.	(225)	(225)	-	-	-	-
EC4	Tackling uncrystallised debt	Income Generation	This proposal comprises an opportunity to achieve new income potential by starting a process of tackling the uncrystallised debt in the commercial portfolio	(50)	(50)	-	-	-	-
EC5	Outdoor media advertising	Income Generation	Proposal to generate new income from outdoor media, utilising the council’s landholdings by identifying sites suitable for outdoor installations. It is estimated that net income in 2019/20 would be at least £100k, and increasing significantly over future years.	(15)	-	(15)	-	-	-
Economy Totals				(425)	(410)	(15)	-	-	-

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: EC1

Title of Option:	Sustainability Planning Advice Income – Carbon Management and Planning Service		
Priority:	Economy	Responsible Officer:	Joe Baker / Emma Williamson
Affected Service(s):	Carbon Management and Planning	Contact / Lead:	Joe Baker

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

To make a saving of £60,000 from the Carbon Management Service base budget, and to replace this saving with income from the Planning Service for the same amount (secured through a Service Level Agreement). This income from the Planning Service would be secured through Planning Performance Agreement Fees. The Carbon Management Service would then continue, and increase, its support the Planning Service through advice and technical specification on planning applications and issues related to carbon reduction, energy and sustainability. The level of support and the timeframes will need to be set out in the agreed Service Level Agreement between the two services.

The Carbon Management Service already undertakes this work for the planning service to ensure that the policies around Carbon Reduction, Local Energy Production, and Sustainability are secured in the planning process. This SLA and budget adjustment would better reflect the arrangement, and allow for it to mature and improve on a stable footing, while reducing the demand placed on the Council's base revenue budget by the Carbon Management team.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)	312,500				
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Existing Budget	£313	£253	£253	£253	£253
Proposed net expenditure after savings	£253	£253	£253	£253	£253
Savings	£60	£0	£0	£0	£0
New net additional savings (year on year)	£60				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>There should be no impact on the services offered, but fees collected from the Planning Service may have to increase.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Planning fees (pre-application advice) may have to increase.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>Carbon reduction and sustainability is a statutory requirement and its process has been embedded through the planning service through the SEA Directive, and the NPPF. Though supporting the Carbon Management Service in this manner it will ensure that this statutory function can continue.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Planning fees reduce in volume.			To continue to promote that borough as a place to do business in.
Environmental Standard are not required			To monitor national, regional and local policies.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: EC2

Title of Option:	Reduction in Consultancy Budget		
Priority:	Economy	Responsible Officer:	Peter O'Brien
Affected Service(s):	Regeneration	Contact / Lead:	David Lee

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Regeneration are proposing to save £75k in our central budget (V30001), from an allocation of £250k in 2017/18 for GL code 24005 (Fees – Consultants).

This budget line has typically been allocated to cover large contracts and project delivery requirements.

As some Tottenham Regeneration activities shift from a focus on initial strategies and feasibility work to delivery stage, there is increasing scope to explore funding these types of contracts from other sources, including but not limited to capitalisation of costs, utilising both internal and external funding sources. It is therefore not proposed that the work undertaken in this area would change, but that funding for this work would be sought from other sources.

We do not expect that this will impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes, nor will this affect statutory requirements as the work that Regeneration undertakes is not statutory. There is a risk that some exploratory/feasibility work may take longer to commence, or will not happen in a given financial year, if alternative funding sources cannot be identified.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	75				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>As above, the most significant risk is that some feasibility, technical or commercial work may take longer to commence and there will be a reduction in operational flexibility. This may require managing expectations around how much feasibility work can be undertaken in a given year, which may impact on the council's housing and development aspirations.</p> <p>The Regeneration Department will work to try and identify alternative sources of funding to seek to mitigate this risk.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>There is minimal impact on relevant stakeholders, as above; however if cumulative savings pressures were to increase substantially this could impact on the Regeneration Team's ability to continue to match fund its significant external investment secured to date. It is believed that the £75k savings can be offset through capitalising costs and, where this is not possible, that an internal review of subsidiary budgets can offset this reduction in the central budget.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>This £75k makes a contribution of 0.7% of the £11m savings expected in 2019/20.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There is a risk that, as Regeneration budgets shrink, it is unable to meet match funding requirements for external funding secured.	H	L	Budget holders with responsibility for externally funded projects to ensure that adequate match funding remains in place.
Risk that cumulative savings proposals impact on the Regeneration Team's ability to deliver the ambitious change laid out in the Tottenham and Wood Green SRFs.	M	L	The Regeneration Team is continuing to explore further capitalising costs and will continue to leverage in external funding sources in order to deliver large-scale change.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: EC3

Title of Option:	Deletion of Senior post		
Priority:	Economy	Responsible Officer:	Helen Fisher
Affected Service(s):	HRP	Contact / Lead:	

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Background

Following consultation with Corporate Leadership Group, it was decided that a senior management restructure was required to establish and clarify the role of strategic leadership, required to effectively deliver the Council’s priorities in light of recent changes. The restructure would involve:

- achieving a flatter, more coherent structure and improve reporting lines;
- work towards a more joined up, corporate way of working;
- to create stability in the senior management structure;
- to establish a more coherent approach to commissioning;
- focus on the need to develop our approach to partnership working;
- to create a Corporate Board structure in place of SLT;
- the need to ensure that the senior leadership of the council is as cost-effective as possible whilst delivering strong leadership.

The proposal included deletion of a number of posts as well as creating, and re-designating a number of other roles.

Proposal

The Strategic Director of Regeneration, Planning & Development was re-designated as Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, and along with this, it was proposed to delete the Director of Regeneration post. It has been agreed that the restructure of the senior level within Housing, Regeneration & Planning will take place at a later date as part of a second phase of the above restructure. The Director of Regeneration is currently acting up into the role of Director of Housing, Regeneration & Planning due to a vacancy. Whilst the detailed decision on the deletion of the post can be determined at a later date, there is a saving currently due to the vacancy and it is proposed that this saving could be realised immediately.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Existing Budget	£425				
Proposed net expenditure after savings	£200				
Savings	£225				
New net additional savings (year on year)	£225				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>N/A</p> <p>Customers will not be directly impacted, staff have managed impact to ensure seamless transition. Proposal is currently in operation.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>This results in one post being deleted, however this proposal is already in operation with negative impacts experienced. All parties involved have been notified.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Delay in implementation	L	M	

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: EC4

Title of Option:	Strategic Property Unit – New Income Proposal		
Priority:	Economy/Your Council	Responsible Officer:	Steve Carr
Affected Service(s):	Housing, Regeneration & Planning	Contact / Lead:	Bill Ogden

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

This proposal comprises an opportunity to achieve new income potential by starting a process of **tackling the uncrystallised debt** in the commercial portfolio:

1. **Existing Proposal:** There is a level of uncrystallised debt in the commercial portfolio, which is estimated at circa £225k per annum. This has arisen from a backlog of outstanding rent reviews as well as tenants holding over under expired leases, where lease renewals still have to be negotiated. The existing professional staff in the Strategic Property team does not have the capacity to address this and it is proposed to secure an additional agency resource to tackle this backlog. The proposed cost of an agency surveyor through Hays is circa £75k per annum. We estimate this would achieve a net increased income to the Council during 2019/20 of £150k per annum. **Update:** An agency surveyor commenced at the end of June and has already made encouraging progress in inspecting units, initiating rental negotiations and achieving two rental settlements.
2. **Additional Proposal:** It is estimated that there is further potential to release more income, estimated at £225k per annum, from retrospective and ongoing rent reviews and lease renewals, which is beyond the capacity of existing professional staff to handle. It is proposed to recruit a second agency resource through Hays to undertake this work at a cost of circa £75k per annum to commence in September 2018. We estimate this would achieve a net increased income to the Council during 2019/20 of £150k per annum
3. In Summary, we estimate that in 2019/20 a **total gross new income of £450k** per annum could be achieved from rent review/lease renewal settlements given an outlay of £150k, giving a net new income flow of £300k per annum.
4. We would thus offer up £300,000 income to be set against the ongoing budget deficit of the SPU team that has arisen from the carrying cost of the supernumerary posts, which were deleted in anticipation of the HDV.
5. Note – this exercise cannot be scaled-up without further resource allocation to the property function.

2. Financial benefits analysis					
Saving / Cost <i>All savings / costs shown on an incremental basis</i>	2019/20 £000s	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s
A. Gross saving	-450				
B. Revenue implementation cost (One Off Pressure)					
C. Ongoing revenue cost	150				
D. Net Saving (A+B+C)	-300	0	0	0	0
E. Saving(s) already included in MTFS 2018/23	-250				
F. New net additional saving (D minus E)	-50	0	0	0	0

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> <p>Rent reviews and lease renewals can give rise to issues of tenant affordability, which can be addressed through good communication and dialogue with tenants, and in some cases agreement of stepped rents or payment plans.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> <p>As above</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> <p>The Council is under an obligation to ensure it achieves best value from the commercial portfolio</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Tenant affordability	M	M	Good communication and dialogue with tenants, with agreement of stepped rents and payment plans if appropriate

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: EC5

Title of Option:	Strategic Property Unit – New Income Proposal		
Priority:	P4/PX	Responsible Officer:	Steve Carr
Affected Service(s):	Housing, Regeneration & Planning	Contact / Lead:	Bill Ogden

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

This proposal comprises an opportunity to achieve new income potential from the introduction of outdoor media, beginning with regularisation of existing media/advertising on our estate:

6. There is significant income potential to be achieved from Outdoor Media advertising across the Council's commercial estate, including development sites and highway land. At present there is only one lease of an advertising billboard in the commercial portfolio. The income potential from Outdoor Media is well proven and many London Boroughs are achieving valuable income from this. It is therefore proposed initially to instruct a specialist consultant to undertake an assessment of the Council's landholdings to identify suitable sites for Outdoor Media installations and in doing so to identify existing illegal advertising on Council property where action can be taken to regularise. The initial Stage 1 assessment is estimated at a cost of £15k. Thereafter, subject to planning consent and Member agreement, it is estimated that net income in 2019/20 would be not less than £100k, increasing significantly over future years. It is not possible at this stage to accurately forecast future income flows until an initial assessment has been completed, but it is not unusual for Boroughs to achieve many times this per annum depending on their location and appetite of advertisers.
7. In Summary, we estimate that in 2019/20 a total gross new income of £115k could be achieved from Outdoor Media given an outlay of £15k, giving a net new income flow of £100k per annum.
8. We would thus offer up £100,000 income to be set against the ongoing budget deficit of the SPU team that has arisen from the carrying cost of the supernumerary posts which were deleted in anticipation of the HDV.
9. Note – this exercise cannot be scaled-up without further resource allocation to the property function. We will address this wider issue of income generation and cost cover in the Commercial Property Review exercise that is intended to go to Corporate Board in September and will influence the restructure programme of the Housing, Regeneration and Planning Directorate.

2. Financial benefits analysis					
Saving / Cost	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings / costs shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
A. Gross saving	-450				
B. Revenue implementation cost (One Off Pressure)					
C. Ongoing revenue cost	150				
D. Net Saving (A+B+C)	-300	0	0	0	0
E. Saving(s) already included in MTFs 2018/23	-250				
F. New net additional saving (D minus E)	-50	0	0	0	0

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Any cases of illegal advertising on Council land would be subject to action to regularise either through formal agreements or in some cases removal</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Suggested early discussion with Cabinet Member on Outdoor Media proposals to secure support and agree guidelines</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>Outdoor Media companies would be responsible for securing appropriate planning and building regulation consents as appropriate</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Outdoor Media installations require planning consent	M	M	Discussion with Planners at early stage. Seek alternative sites
Outdoor Media content not compliant with council policy	M	L	Ensure that licences and Heads of terms incorporate council policy and are reviewed by Comms and Procurement teams
Outdoor Media proposals may be politically sensitive	M	M	Early discussion with Cabinet Member and agree guidelines for advertising content

Priority Five – Budget Reductions

Summary of Budget Reduction Proposals - Housing

Housing				All Years	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Ref	Title	Category	Description	Net Saving (All)	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings
				£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
HO1	Temporary accommodation reduction plan	Other	Reduce TA costs, as detailed in the TA Reduction Plan. Proposals include initiatives to prevent homelessness, improve economic position of those in TA, and help support those in TA to move on. Revenue costs covered by the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant. Plan also includes proposals to increase supply of low cost TA through new purchase, repair and management joint venture partnership, and capital investment in new Community Benefit Society. Please note that due to the additional costs incurred due to unforeseen works at BWF, it may not be possible to meet the projected savings.	(2,201)	(920)	(708)	(573)	-	-
HO2	Explore opportunities to capitalise development team costs	Other	Proposal to charge salaries of staff within housing development and enabling team to the Housing Revenue Account, as their work is now focused on bringing forward sites for direct housing development. Approximately 40% of salaries are currently funded by the HRA, and it's proposed to increase this to 100%.	(150)	(150)	-	-	-	-
Housing Totals				(2,351)	(1,070)	(708)	(573)	-	-

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: HO1

Title of Option:	Temporary Accommodation Reduction Plan		
Priority:	Housing	Responsible Officer:	Alan Benson
Affected Service(s):		Contact / Lead:	Alan Benson

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Background

The Council has a statutory duty to provide temporary accommodation (TA) to households who have been accepted as Statutorily Homeless until they can be discharged, usually through an offer of settled accommodation.

Haringey has just under 3,000 households in such accommodation including around 2,600 placed in private sector accommodation. The costs of these properties is, in most cases, significantly in excess of the Local Housing Allowance (the maximum amount of Housing Benefit which can be claimed in the private rented sector) and so the council is required to subsidise these properties to ensure that they are affordable to these households. The current budget for this in the MTFs is £7.1 million per annum.

Proposals

The proposals to reduce this cost are contained in the Temporary Accommodation Reduction Plan. These proposals include initiatives to prevent homelessness, to improve the economic position of those who are in temporary accommodation and to help people move on – with the revenue costs of these covered by the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant. They also include proposals to increase the supply of lower-cost temporary accommodation through a new Purchase Repair & Management Joint Venture Partnership and capital investment in a new Community Benefit Society.

However please note that due to the additional costs incurred due to unforeseen works at BWF, it may not be possible to meet the projected savings. Other options are currently being scoped in order to ensure savings are met.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Existing Budget	£7,100	£6,180	£5,472	£4,899	£4,899
Proposed net expenditure after savings	£6,180	£5,472	£4,899	£4,899	£4,899
Savings	£920	£708	£573	£0	£0

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Improved temporary accommodation offer for homeless households, with properties meeting agreed minimum standards at an LHA rent. The quality of service will also improve, as housing services will be provided by a housing association or Homes for Haringey, rather than by the often unreliable arrangements put in place by private landlords.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Reduced reliance on private landlords. Depending on exact arrangements, Homes for Haringey may provide housing management services to more homes.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>The Council has a statutory duty to provide temporary accommodation (TA) to households who have been accepted as Statutorily Homeless until they can be discharged, usually through an offer of settled accommodation. This will allow us to achieve this duty for less money and provide better quality accommodation.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact	Probability	Mitigation
	H/M/L	H/M/L	
See attached detailed Risk Register for the Housing Delivery Companies programme.			

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: HO2

Title of Option:	Capitalisation of Development team salary costs		
Priority:	Economy	Responsible Officer:	Dan Hawthorn
Affected Service(s):	HRP	Contact / Lead:	Alan Benson

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council’s objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Background

One of the Council’s key priorities is to deliver new council housing on council-owned land as part of the target to provide 1,000 new Council homes by 2022. A Development & Enabling team exists within the Housing Strategy & Commissioning team to work up proposals for – and then deliver – new homes on medium-sized council-owned land, the majority of which is currently held in the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). Because the nature of this team’s work is changing and it will now be working to bring forward sites for direct housing development, it is proposed that the salaries of a number of staff in the development team are now charged to the HRA in full:

Proposals

In order to facilitate required general fund savings it is proposed to charge the salaries of key development team staff fully to the HRA.
2 x Senior Housing Project Managers and 1x Housing Project Manager.

Approximately 40% of these salaries are currently funded by the HRA and it is proposed to increase this to 100% and offer the balance as a saving to the General Fund.

Current Housing Strategy & Commissioning General Fund budget - £914,300
Existing MTFs Savings - none
Net New Savings - £150k

2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Existing Budget	914	764	764	764	764
Proposed net expenditure after savings	764	764	764	764	764
Savings	150	0	0	0	0
New net additional savings (year on year)	150	0	0	0	0

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>N/A</p> <p>Customers will not be impacted.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>The proposal is to increase the level of salaries charged to the HRA. This will reduced the amount of HRA funding for other requirements, but the cost is not considered significant and leads to the provision of additional housing to be let in future.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
HRA will not be able to fund other requirements/projects.	L	L	The level of funding required from the HRA relative to the total value of the account is very low, and leads to the provision of additional housing to be let in future.

Summary of PX (Your Council) budget reductions

		2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total
Ref	Title	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
YC1	Out of home advertising income generation	(129)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(6)	(151)
YC2	Remove ward budgets	(190)	-	-	-	-	(190)
	Your Council Totals	(319)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(6)	(341)

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: YC01

Title of Option:	Out of home advertising income generation		
Priority:	Your Council	Responsible Officer:	Joanna Sumner
Affected Service(s):	Strategy & Communications	Contact / Lead:	Lesley Gordon/Eleri Salter

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Haringey Council currently has a street furnishing advertising contract with JCDecaux. The contract in its current form has run for over 20 years and includes 29 static single poster council information panels (CIPs) which offer Haringey the opportunity to place its communication messages on the boards at no cost. The CIP split across the borough is: Wood Green (19), Seven Sisters (8) and Bounds Green (2).

The current contract terminates at the end of September 2018. We are currently in the process of procuring a new solution working alongside Highways, Planning, Procurement and Legal. The introduction of a new contract and solution will give the council a new income stream and the opportunity to update the current static CIPs to digital CIPs to maximise income generation while also having the opportunity to display council messages.

Moving into a digital display environment would not only ensure that Haringey's communication messages can be updated quickly, it also means there are no printing costs.

The aim is to work with one selected outdoor advertising company. The chosen provider would work closely with the Planning and Highways to ensure that any new street furnishings would be sympathetic to the surroundings, future borough plans and opportunities.

Haringey will receive a percentage return from advertising revenue generated by the advertising company. Haringey would ensure that a percentage of the display would be reserved for council communications.

We will aim to:

- Upgrade all current street furnishings to digital panels and identify and implement (subject to planning permission) new digital sites to ensure that messages can be either targeted or more evenly spread throughout the Borough.
- Agree a percentage of advertising revenue returns to Haringey (to the strategy & communications function).
- Agree a percentage of time to display council messages.
- Ensure Business Rates are paid by the advertising company
- Ensure the chosen provider implement and maintain all locations.

Based on the procurement timescales we expect the new contract to be in place by October 2018.

The projections below are based on the current 29 sites in place and will increase if further assets are added. It should be noted that income projections could increase as we will also receive 10%

of any sales over and above projected income.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings	175	5	5	6	6

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> <p>The income generation clearly allows us to work towards a situation where the communication function reduces its actual cost to the organisation.</p> <p>The digital aspect of these sites means that the council will be able to use them more flexibly for our own campaigns.</p> <p>There is a need to develop an organisation-wide protocol setting out our approach to income generation from sponsorship and advertising</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> <p>There is some impact on highways and planning services which has been discussed with them throughout the ITT process. Procurement colleagues have also been heavily involved.</p> <p>As well as generating income this contract will allow us to utilise infrastructure and technology to make positive change, as well as delivering ambitious green initiatives.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> <p>N/A</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
This is a fairly low risk option but there will be a planning process to be navigated.	L	L	Highways and planning colleagues have been involved throughout this process.
No Cabinet Approval	H	L	This proposal has been discussed with the CEX and Leader in detail.