

Report for: Special Overview & Scrutiny Committee Meeting - 3 January 2024

Title: Call-In of a decision taken at Cabinet on 5 December 2023 on Leisure Management

Report authorised by: Barry Francis, Director of Environment & Resident Experience

Lead Officer: Zoe Robertson, Head of Place, zoe.robertson@haringey.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

**Report for Key/
Non-Key Decision:** Key Decision

1. Describe the issue under consideration.

1.1 On 5 December 2023, Cabinet agreed the following recommendations in a report presented to them:

1.1.1 Having considered the available options presented, Haringey Council's leisure services shall be brought back inhouse as described in Option 5 (section 6.32), for the reasons set out in this report, including the TUPE process for Fusion's Haringey workforce.

1.1.2 Following the serving of the 12 months' voluntary termination notice on Fusion Lifestyle on 3rd October 2023, inhouse leisure service provision shall commence no later than 2nd October 2024.

1.1.3 The revenue budget and capital programme implications of the decision to insource be included in the draft Medium Term Financial Strategy for 2024/25.

1.1.4 The decision to novate any or all the related contracts (including those considered as key decisions) from the existing service provider to the Council be delegated to the Director of Environment and Resident Experience.

1.2 Following a Call-In of that decision made in accordance with Council procedures, this report provides further information to support the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's (OSC) consideration of the issues raised in the Call-In.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

2.1 My introduction to the original report considered by Cabinet on 5 December 2023 sets out the case for that decision. This report deals with the specific points raised by the Call-In.

2.2 It is disappointing that this decision has been called-in as insourcing the leisure service is a significant opportunity for the Council to improve services for residents, to improve working terms and conditions for its staff and provide employment and development opportunities for our residents. Insourcing this

service is in line with the manifesto commitment made by Haringey Labour in 2022 and the mandate we were elected upon and where Labour gained seats in the borough.

- 2.3 Haringey Council has already demonstrated that it can insource leisure services; the leisure service at New River - which were brought inhouse just two years ago - has shown what a Labour council can do when it collaborates with and listens to its residents – responding directly to their views and making services inclusive to the diverse communities in our borough. Since August 2021, the Council has improved the services and the facilities on offer and increased the financial performance of the New River site.
- 2.4 Haringey Council has ambition for a tailored service that meets the needs of Haringey residents. We can deliver a service that can be integrated and adapted as required to deliver continuous improvement for residents. The best way to do this is through direct control of services, not through a restrictive and inflexible contract that fixes us into a model of delivery for a long period of time.
- 2.5 The outcome of this extensive piece of work was contained in the report that went before Cabinet on 5 December 2023.
- 2.6 I confirm my view that nothing raised in the Call-In or set out in this report changes my view that the decision taken on the 5 December is the correct one and should be upheld.

3. Recommendations.

- 3.1 On the basis of the information provided in the Cabinet report of 5 December and in this report, it is recommended that the Committee reject this Call-In and take no further action.

4. Reasons for decision.

- 4.1 N/a

5. Alternative options considered.

- 5.1 N/a

6. The Decision and the Call-In

- 6.1 On 5 December 2023, Cabinet approved the recommendations set out in the report entitled 'Leisure Management'. The decision and the report are available on the Council's website and a corresponding weblink is provided in Section 22: background papers.
- 6.2 Following the issuing of the draft minutes for the Cabinet meeting, a Call-In of that decision was received and validated, in line with agreed Council procedures. Accordingly, the matter is now to be considered by the Overview

and Scrutiny Committee. Sections 7-17 of this report describe and respond to each of the reasons given for the Call-In.

7. **Call-in issue a) The decision to insource leisure services has been taken without providing evidence to decision makers and the public that the Council has rigorously examined whether this decision provides best value for money for Haringey taxpayers.**
- 7.1 The options presented to the Cabinet went through a rigorous financial analysis in the preparation of the report and its recommendations. Officers worked with FMG Consulting Ltd (FMG), independent specialist consultants, to cost a range of options, including pricing an inhouse service and developing a comparable estimate of what a market bid for a replacement contract might be. This was then tested and challenged in collaboration with colleagues in Finance to ensure it was robust.
- 7.2 In preparing the Cabinet Report presented on 5 December 2023, officers decided to summarise the cost headlines rather than provide details of the financial model. The reason for this was that the cost modelling would need to be provided in a Part B exempt report, due to the commercial and contractual sensitivity of the information in the model. To keep the whole report in the public domain, it was decided to use headline cost totals, rather than complex and confidential analysis, which of necessity are extremely detailed and technical.
- 7.3 A key benefit to an inhouse service is the enhanced salary that can be offered to staff through improved terms and conditions and pensions compared to the private sector. The Council is committed to harmonising the leisure workforce onto the Council's terms and conditions and this is welcomed and supported by the Trade Unions. By contrast, Fusion does not recognise the Unions, nor does much of the leisure sector.
- 7.4 This workforce, a large proportion of whom are Haringey residents, can expect to have better training and progression opportunities with the Council, which will lead to a more motivated, loyal workforce, lower sickness rates, and a better standard of candidate for the service. The Council can also drive local employment opportunities, further benefiting residents in our communities. The improved terms and conditions for staff is the main driver of the price differential between an inhouse service and a new contract.
- 7.5 Assessment of what option provides 'best value' should not be solely limited to cost but must also consider the environmental and social value benefits. Given the Council's Net Zero carbon aspirations and the importance of the Wellbeing Model referenced in the Cabinet report of 5 December 2023, a more balanced approach was taken in setting out the pros and cons of the options available. Any procurement process aids the identification of which service provider might provide the cheapest offer – but not necessarily the one that provides best overall value to Haringey's residents. Last time, through the leisure management procurement and contract award process, the Council went for the cheapest option and outsourced - but it did not deliver the best outcomes for the borough.
- 7.6 The Council can provide services for local residents better than the commercial market as it understands the complexities between driving local economic growth and prosperity with an intent purpose of providing quality services that

are effective and affordable. In this way, the Council drives continuous improvements in service delivery. The most flexible way to achieve that is through direct delivery, rather than under the constraints of a fixed arrangement contract.

7.7 It should also be noted that a 'do nothing' option of continuing with Fusion under the existing contract would have led to a financial growth bid for 2024/25 in the region of £1m. This was required to account for the increase in energy and utility prices. The 'do nothing' option was not included in the options presented to Cabinet on 5 December 2023 as it was not viable because the Council had already given Fusion 12 months' notice of termination.

8. Call-in issue b) The decision has been taken on the basis of a vague list of benefits of insourcing, with no effort made to quantify the costs and benefits of different options.

8.1 This point is incorrect. The Cabinet report of 5 December 2023 was open about the costs of insourcing and explicit in listing the benefits.

8.2 The benefits of insourcing, as stated in the Cabinet report in section 6.32.1, include:

- The Council would have full control of leisure management and operation of the leisure centres, as well as full accountability for the service offer and performance.
- There would be optimal future flexibility in the design and shape of the service offer including integrating with the developing Wellbeing Model and targeting health inequalities.
- An ability to adapt to different policy and charging areas across the Council that, for example, would be otherwise restricted by an outsourced leisure management model (i.e., Option 1).
- An ability to change the operation as needed such as opening hours, pricing structures and/or targeting different groups. This would be challenging to achieve if Option 1 (a new contract) were to be pursued.
- Better terms and conditions for the workforce and ability to focus on recruiting locally.
- A consistent but far broader leisure service offer across the three leisure centres, New River Sport and Fitness and, in the future, Bull Lane.

8.3 These benefits are significant, particularly in the light of the current budgetary challenges of the Council. Having the service in the Council's direct control allows the service to be adapted, grown and flexed as necessary rather than locked into a restrictive contract with fixed costs over the next 3-5+ years.

8.4 The costs of the different options were discussed with key Cabinet Members in advance of Cabinet, as part of the preparation of the report, the proposed Medium Term Financial Strategy and the recommendations for both associated reports. Cost was just one part of the evaluation of the options (see paragraph 7.5 above and section 9 below).

8.5 The Council has spent many months preparing for the recommendation made to Cabinet on 5 December 2023. A robust governance framework was in place, including:

- Regular Leisure Management Strategic Group checkpoint meetings, chaired by the Director of Environment and Resident Experience, and attended by the Chief Executive, the Director of Finance, the Head of Finance and the Monitoring Officer, were held from January 2023 onwards.
- Regular meetings with FMG – commencing January 2023
- Enhanced high level meetings with Fusion – ongoing throughout 2023.
- Fortnightly meetings of the internal Leisure Management Working Group (chaired by the Assistant Director Direct Services, with cross-Council officer representation assessing six different workstreams) from April 2023 onwards.
- External stakeholder discussions with the private sector.
- Multiple discussions with other authorities – from February 2023
- Strategic Council Leadership meeting – considering leisure options - April 2023
- Commercial Board - May 2023
- Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) - June 2023
- Strategic Council Leadership meeting – considering leisure options - June 2023
- Internal services workshop – July 2023
- Overview & Scrutiny Committee - July 2023
- Cabinet - Decision to terminate the Fusion contract - July 2023
- Budget Fortnight – Development of the Wellbeing Model – July 2023
- Early market engagement exercise – August 2023
- Leisure Management Strategic Group checkpoint meeting – August 2023
- Leisure Management Strategic Group checkpoint meeting – September 2023
- Commercial Board – September 2023
- CLT - October 2023
- Strategic Council Leadership meeting - options update - October 2023
- Internal services workshop – November 2023
- Overview & Scrutiny Committee - November 2023
- Cabinet - decision to insource - December 2023

8.6 The tri-partite (Council, Fusion and Park Road Lido Users Group) meetings continued to be held on a monthly basis during 2023, updating the PRLUG representatives as appropriate.

9. **Call-in issue c) There is no scoring system between the various options.**

9.1 The approach to scoring the five available options (which excluded contract continuation with Fusion) were set out in paragraphs 6.24 to 6.49 of the report of 5 December to Cabinet. They considered each of the options in respect of risk and issue management in terms of:

1. Wellbeing Model
2. Workforce
3. Finance
4. Procurement
5. Performance
6. Mobilisation/operations.

- 9.2 Officers consider its evaluation approach to be consistent with, and using the key principles of, the Government's 2021 preferred evaluation model development approach 'Bid Evaluation Guidance Note' (as referenced in Section 22: background papers). The Government's focus on determining best value for money ensures equal consideration is given to evaluating social value, price and quality.
- 9.3 The option appraisal process was extensive and continually iterative as data and information were received, analysed and assessed in the period from the first Leisure Management Strategic Group in January 2023 up until the submission of the 5 December Cabinet report. The table below is an options review summary from October 2023 and shows the considerations on each of the 5 options alongside estimated financial impacts of each option (albeit they are numbered differently from how they appeared in the 5 December Cabinet report and, thereby, in this report).

Options Review Summary



Option 1 Insource	Option 2 Award new contract	Option 3 Close leisure centres & mothball	Option 4 Lease sites to commercial provider	Option 5 Close leisure centres & sell sites
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bring service inhouse and develop alongside wellbeing model Invest in centres to increase commercial potential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early market engagement - contract needs to be minimum of 5 years (ideally 10 or 5+5) At least four providers interested in bidding for the contract – all with experience of pivoting to wellbeing models 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No revenue savings due to NNDR, security and maintenance costs Avoids energy costs Avoids need for capital investment Focus on wellbeing model Cost pressure – Fusion's redundancy costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites leased to new provider – council withdraws from management Focus on wellbeing model No revenue savings until sites leased due to NNDR, security and maintenance costs Avoids energy costs Avoids need for capital investment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites sold – no leisure centres Focus on wellbeing model No revenue savings until sites sold due to NNDR, security and maintenance costs Avoids energy costs Avoids need for capital investment Impacts library & CS centre
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £1.5m (inc. pressure for energy) £10.6m+ capital investment over 10 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £800k (= to energy increase) £10.6m+ capital investment over 10 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No revenue savings Avoid/defer capital costs of £8.6m 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lease income – £200k TBC (Yr 2) Rev savings – up to £443k (Yr 2) Avoid capital costs of £8.6m 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital receipts TBC (Year 2) Rev savings – up to £443k (Year 2) Avoid capital costs of £8.6m
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £10.6m capital £900k rev growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £10.6m capital £200k rev growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £1.7m capital £TBC redundancy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £1.7m capital £643k rev saving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £1.7m capital £443k rev saving

- 9.4 When the options for New River Sport and Fitness were explored in 2021, the Enabling Review Framework was used. Through that process, the task was to identify which options warranted further consideration and which options were deemed non-viable. In essence, that same process was followed in Section 6 of the Cabinet report of 5 December. However, for the sake of completeness, the five options for the future of leisure management could be assessed in a similar manner to the New River approach (adapted to meet changes to priorities/terminology) which considered the go/no-go decision on the basis of the following seven criteria:

1. Time – the Council, having taken a decision to end the contract with Fusion, needed to deliver a viable alternative within the 12-month timeframe for the voluntary termination.
2. Corporate Delivery Plan (CDP) objectives – to what extent does each option allow the Council to match the leisure service against these. [N.B. In the New River assessment, this was against the former ‘Borough Plan’].
3. Level of control – how much control / influence will the Council have over the running of leisure service for each option.
4. Risk – how much risk is there in implementing the option successfully.
5. Risk - the level of residual risk for the Council in terms of implications in the short-term and longer-term liability.
6. Cost – the cost to implement this option.
7. Cost - the longer-term cost implications for the Council.

9.5 The above and the content of Section 6 of the Cabinet report is considered to translate into the following table:

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
	New contract	Mothball	Lease the sites	Sell/ Redevelop	Insource
Time to act	Okay	Okay	Unlikely	Highly unlikely	Okay
CDP	Medium	Low	Low	Low	High
Control of leisure	Medium	Low	Low	Low	High
Delivery risk	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Residual risk	Medium	High	High	High	Medium
Short-term cost	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	High
Long-term cost	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Medium
Go/No-Go	Pass	Fail	Fail	Fail	Pass

9.6 As in the case of New River Sport and Fitness, this reduced the options considered as potentially viable down to just two. Applying the next stage of assessment for the two ‘pass’ options against the model used for New River Sport and Fitness gives the outcome shown in the table below where scores can range from 0 for low and 4 for high, with the three most important criteria having a double weighting, leading to a maximum score of 8. When the leisure options appraisal criteria referred to in paragraph 9.1 above and detailed in Section 6 of the 5 December Cabinet report is applied to the Enabling Review Framework, there is consistency in evaluation and consideration.

9.7 The table below indicates the scoring breakdown of the leisure options appraisal criteria when applied to the Enabling Review Framework

Enabling Framework Criteria	Leisure Options Appraisal Criteria	Weighting	New contract	Insource
Affordability and value for money	Financial	1	4	3
Performance and service quality	Performance	2	6	8
Capability	Mobilisation	1	3	3
Organisational capacity	Operations	1	3	3
Social and environmental values	Wellbeing Model	2	4	8
Timing	Procurement	2	8	8
Market conditions	Procurement	1	3	3
Risk	Mobilisation/ Operations	1	3	3
Total Score			34/44	39/44
Percentage			77.2%	88.6%

9.8 These tables provide a graphical interpretation of the narrative provided in the Cabinet Report of 5 December 2023. The above representation indicates that insourcing would be the preferred model based on a scored approach.

10. **Call-in issue d) No information has been provided to Cabinet about the comparative cost of a new leisure management contract in the immediate term, despite several providers displaying interest.**

10.1 Early market engagement was conducted as part of the analysis of the options and preparation of costs. Four providers responded and were positive about the opportunity presented by a new contract. Some concern was raised by providers about the condition of the assets and short proposed term of the contract (2-5 years). It was recognised that investment in the centres will lead to increased revenue through income, but these can take years to develop and realise.

10.2 The early market engagement process was not designed to get indicative contract costs. This work was done through detailed modelling and analysis with FMG. This modelling estimated that a new contract would cost an additional £250k per year on top of existing leisure management budgets to deliver. Many authorities have chosen to end their contractual relationship with Fusion at this time – some through early exit, others by contracts merely expiring - which reduces the market's capacity to not only bid for new contracts but also to service them to the standard that the Council would wish and Haringey residents rightly deserve. Thus, bidding for contracts may not necessarily drive value and, in a volatile market, it would be prudent to consider adding a 20% contingency to the total overall operating costs of an external service provider who would also price for risk. This would potentially close the gap between an insourced service (over

which there is control and flexibility) and an outsourced one (far more constrained) to circa £500k.

11. Call-in issue e) No attempt has been made to interrogate the ongoing costs of running leisure services inhouse or under a new contract, despite Haringey's overall poor financial position.

11.1 This is incorrect. Financial analysis conducted by the corporate Finance Team has been crucial to understanding operational costs and budgeting for the new inhouse leisure service. FMG has used this financial insight in building the costed models for both an inhouse and contracted service. These models were subjected to rigorous and robust interrogation and the Council's Section 151 Officer was part of the Leisure Management Strategic Group of officers overseeing the development of the options.

11.2 The Council already has experience of running inhouse leisure services, as seen at New River. Since taking New River inhouse, the service has been transformed into one that is performing well, bringing a more diverse range of people into the centre and increasing financial performance. Officers have used their expertise and knowledge to see where savings could be identified in the proposed inhouse model, looking at different opportunities for generating income and reducing operating costs. The service needs to be under direct control to realise these opportunities.

12. Call-in issue f) The report of the external consultant's financial modelling was referenced at the bottom of the cabinet paper but wasn't included with the report – even as an exempt paper.

12.1 The FMG financial models, as referenced in the Cabinet report of 5 December, were not included in the report due to commercial and contractual sensitivities. Information in the FMG report was summarised in the Cabinet report to enable the entire Cabinet report to be available to the public.

12.2 The Council's constitution, Part 4, Section D "Access to Information Procedure Rules", section 8.2 notes that Background Papers do not include published works or those which disclose exempt or confidential information (as defined in Rule 10), or the advice of a political adviser.

13. Call-in issue g) No option was considered for a joint contract with another authority such as Enfield, who have also had issues with Fusion.

13.1 The option of a joint procurement with Enfield Council was explored extensively earlier in the review process, when it became known that Enfield Council was also considering leaving its contract with Fusion. High level discussions between the boroughs were held, including between the respective Leaders, Chief Executives, Directors, Strategic Procurement and service leads.

13.2 The option was discounted for the following reasons:

- In preliminary discussions with Enfield Council, its officers indicated it had little or no resource to offer for any joint procurement work, meaning that it would be left to Haringey Council officers to procure an all-embracing external service provision for both authorities.

- The Cabinet report of 11th July regarding a ‘Leisure Review’ provision indicated that service delivery options would be assessed, and Strategic Procurement would assist in this process and ensure alignment with the Public Contract Regulations 2015.
- The timescales for our procurement did not match – Enfield Council gave notice to Fusion on 18th September with the new contract commencing on 3rd December. Although Haringey Council advised Fusion on 12th July that it wished to end its contract, the 12 months’ notice was formally served on 3rd October 2023.
- Enfield has a significantly larger leisure operation than Haringey, with seven centres compared to our three. Operationally, this could have left Haringey disadvantaged.

14. **Call-in issue h) No consideration has been given to the fact that an inhouse provision means current members of external providers won't be able to use Haringey leisure centres under their existing membership, whereas if a provider that currently provided the service locally were chosen (e.g. Better, who run services in Camden and Islington) then visit rates are likely to increase as existing members could also visit Haringey.**

14.1 The option of awarding a new contract would be open to full market competition. The scenario of residents being able to use facilities in neighbouring boroughs would only apply if the contract was competitively won by Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) operating under the brand ‘Better’. As seen by the early market engagement, GLL would be just one of several companies likely to bid for the new contract, if indeed they did decide to bid for the contract.

14.2 The market is currently volatile with many contracts changing hands, and capacity to bid and mobilise new contracts is likely to be stretched. The option for residents to use facilities outside of the borough was not viewed as a priority in preparing the recommendations, particularly as it could not be guaranteed through a competitive tender process.

15. **Call-in issue i) Residents were not consulted or even asked on their views about who should run the service, with the deputation from the Park Road Lido User Group highlighting significant concerns about insourcing the service.**

15.1 Consultation and engagement with residents is a key priority for the Council in the preparation of the new service offer for October 2024 onwards. Notice was given to Fusion in October 2023, with a contractual end date of October 2024. Given this timeline, it was imperative that a decision was made on the future operating model for the leisure service as quickly as possible. This is because both of the two more viable options (insourcing or a new contract) required at least a nine-month period to action. As such, timeframes did not allow for this engagement to take place in advance of a decision on the future operating model.

15.2 Officers are planning extensive engagement with service users, non-users, stakeholders and partners early in 2024. This is in-line with the Haringey Deal and will help shape the service design going forwards.

- 15.3 In their regular meetings with officers and Fusion representatives, the Park Road Lido User Group has repeatedly expressed its disappointment with the service being provided by Fusion. Through those meetings, officers are well aware of the expectations of that group.
- 15.4 At the Full Council meeting on 13th February 2023, representatives of Haringey Aquatics advised that they had no faith in Fusion to run the borough's leisure centres. By contrast, there have been many calls from residents for the Council to insource the leisure service and, likewise, the decision taken by Cabinet on 5 December has been welcomed by many residents across the borough.
16. **Call in issue j) The council has clearly failed to robustly demonstrate that insourcing leisure services will provide Best Value for Money for residents nor would provide an overall better service for residents than other options, and Cabinet was not provided with sufficient information to take an informed decision; and therefore the decision falls outside the Policy Framework. A call-in would allow a pause on the decision and further scrutiny in detail on the options proposed, and would also allow clarity on whether the decision falls within the budget framework.**
- 16.1 The premise that insourcing does not provide best value is not accepted, for all the reasons presented in this report, and in the Cabinet report of 5 December 2023. To reiterate the comments made in paragraphs 7.5 and 9.6, best value should not be assessed on financial grounds alone. Best value includes social and environmental factors, as well as financial.
- 16.2 Irrespectively, extensive financial modelling has taken place on the options presented with FMG and this was challenged by officers in the service and in Corporate Finance.
- 16.3 A systematic, collaborative and detailed approach was taken to engaging with the Cabinet and Cabinet Member in the preparation of the report and recommendations. Officers have completed the detailed analysis in their preparations and presented a summary of this to Cabinet.
17. **Variation of action proposed: The council should publish a cost / benefit analysis between the five options presented in the Cabinet paper including a financial risk assessment spanning five years which would present best- and worst-case scenarios for each option, perform a robustly and independently graded scoring system between the five options in the Cabinet paper, and consult with key stakeholders and residents before taking a final decision on which option to take. Only when this is completed would the decision satisfy the policy and budget framework.**
- 17.1 Officers believe that robust service and financial analysis has been completed within a strong governance framework, and falls within the Council's Insourcing Policy. As stated in this report, the reason the financial models were not published in full is due to the commercial and contractual sensitivities of the information in the model.
- 17.2 The Council has a demonstrable track record of insourcing leisure services, as seen at New River, and turning around these services to improve the diversity

of services on offer and increase the financial performance of the site. Insourcing further leisure facilities is a clear continuation of this approach.

- 17.3 The contract with Fusion is ending on 2 October 2024. Consultation with stakeholders and residents will take place in early 2024, but it cannot hold up the decision making on the future operating model for leisure or there will be insufficient time to mobilise a new service (or provider) by October 2024. This would lead to service closures if mobilisation was delayed.
- 17.4 Consultation and engagement will enable the Council to listen to the feedback from residents and stakeholders on the future services provided and how they can be best tailored to the needs of our different communities. The question is not who provides these services but what services do our residents want available, and what are the qualities and values of this service.
- 17.5 Insourcing the leisure services is consistent with the Council's approach and brings real benefits. These include the ability to flex and improve service delivery, improvements for the workforce, and to deliver the Council's wellbeing agenda. Only a service under direct control can deliver these ambitions.

18. Contribution to the Corporate Delivery Plan 2022-2024 High level Strategic outcomes?

- 18.1 The contribution of the decision regarding strategic outcomes was set out in the report to Cabinet on 5 December 2023.

19. Carbon and Climate Change

- 19.1 The carbon implications of the decision taken by Cabinet were highlighted in the Cabinet report on 5 December 2023.

20. Statutory Officers' comments

Finance

- 20.1 The Director of Finance & Section 151 Officer has been consulted in the preparation of this report. The financial implications of the decision taken by Cabinet were highlighted in the Cabinet report on 5 December 2023.

Procurement

- 20.2 Strategic Procurement notes the contents of this report. The Call-In primarily relates to a policy decision; therefore, Procurement comments are not applicable as this sits outside of the Procurement Contract Regulations.

Head of Legal & Governance

- 20.3 The legal implications of the decision taken by Cabinet were highlighted in the Cabinet report on 5 December 2023.

Equality

20.4 The equality implications of the decision taken by Cabinet were highlighted in the Cabinet report on 5 December 2023.

21. Use of Appendices

None

22. Background papers

Leisure Management Cabinet Report – 5 December 2023:

<https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/g10558/Public%20reports%20pack%2005th-Dec-2023%2018.30%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10>

Corporate Delivery Plan:

https://intranet/sites/intranet/files/corporate_delivery_plan_-_january_2023.pdf

Policy Framework for Insourcing presented to Cabinet on 8 October 2019:

https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s111629/250919%20Insourcing%20Cabinet%20report_FINAL.pdf

Insourcing Policy:

<https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s111630/260919%20Insourcing%20Policy%20FINAL.pdf>

Council Constitution:

<https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/g7972/Public%20reports%20pack%2015th-May-2023%20London%20Borough%20of%20Haringey%20Constitution.pdf?T=10&Info=1>

Government's Bid Evaluation Guidance Note -

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/987130/Bid_evaluation_guidance_note_May_2021.pdf