

Outstanding Requests for Information on the MTF/ Budget Scrutiny Proposals

Overview & Scrutiny Committee (Corporate, CS&E and E&RE)				
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Response & Any follow up queries from OSC on 18th January	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)
Community Safety, Waste & Enforcement	2023/24 Budget Position	Details to be provided on the part of the underspend relating to “curtailing uncommitted maintenance and improvement works” (page 52 of agenda pack).	Response: The underspend is a result of pausing some of the CCTV capital programme schemes, which means there is a reduction in maintenance and rental charges. There has also been a delay completing some existing schemes due to issues with (UKPN Power & BT fibre) connecting power & transmission the columns.	
Culture, Strategy & Engagement	2023/24 Outturn Position & 2024/25 Budget Position	Noting that the budget pressures relating to Digital and IT services also included factors such as the exchange rate, general inflation, licences/contracts and hardware (in addition to	Response: The £0.23m projected budget pressure in Digital Services reported at Q2 comprised contract pressures of £0.33m offset by an underspend on staffing of £0.10m. The projected contract pressure is based primarily on additional costs being incurred on in-year contract renewals with suppliers raising prices to account for inflation and exchange rate movements. Movement of Digital contract inflation is tracked within the Service with pressures reported as part of the budget monitoring process and forecasted into future financial years to aid budget monitoring and financial planning. The process used to track and report inflation involves complex formulas and calculations which track contracts over multiple years of	

		<p>insourcing costs as above), the Panel requested a breakdown of these costs.</p>	<p>indexation linked to contract regulations and fiscal movement. This makes it difficult to break the causes of increasing contract costs down into a consolidated report in the way requested by the Committee.</p> <p>Follow up Request from 18th January: The Members were unhappy with the response that it was difficult to breakdown the causes of increasing contract costs down into a consolidated report in the way requested by the Committee.</p> <p>The Members asked that a breakdown of the additional costs relating to inflation and exchange rate costs be provided for its next meeting on 1st February.</p> <p>Follow up Response: The original period 6 position reported by Digital services has subsequently changed. The original £0.5m pressure was based on a projection for inflation on contracts and actuals incurred up to period 6 and has been reprofiled to project a year end position and pressure of £0.2m taking account of council-wide provision for contract inflation and costs. The service is managing staffing vacancies to offset this pressure and will seek to conclude the year with a balanced budget.</p> <p>Further to the previous response, of the £0.5m reported at period 6, £300k of it was increased contract costs. The projected contract pressure is a combination of actual increased costs where contracts have been renewed and estimates based on predictions of those to be renewed later in the year. We cannot easily differentiate in this between inflation and exchange rates.</p> <p>E.g. an overseas supplier prices in pounds and may include a combination of exchange costs and inflation pricing to determine their final price. Examples of this are AWS – Amazon Web services and</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>SAP (our financial and HR management system). Or a UK reseller pricing in £'s against the \$ such as our Core Enterprise agreement and Security (the Council's Firewall).</p> <p>A core enterprise agreement is a commercial business agreement usually covering licenses and support for the core operating systems such as Microsoft used by the Council. A single vendor may have multiple types of licences to permit access to different resources, functionality, and services.</p> <p>We can however break down the £300k increased contract cost into the following categories and applications:</p> <p>The major contributing factors were increased costs of the Core Enterprise agreement - Circa £129k, related to Microsoft licence, costs and use. In addition:</p> <table data-bbox="952 691 1608 798"> <tr> <td>Firewall Costs * Council Security</td> <td>£28k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sonus Voice appliance support</td> <td>£4k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Off Site Backup and storage</td> <td>£4k</td> </tr> </table> <p>IT Managed service Contracts for Maintenance (Managed on behalf of Services) - £50k increased contract costs:</p> <table data-bbox="1093 914 1568 1383"> <tr> <td>AutoCAD</td> <td>£10k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carevision</td> <td>£1k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adobe</td> <td>£1k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cipfa (FinanceMgt)</td> <td>£0.6k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Express (Elections)</td> <td>£3.6k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Home Finder</td> <td>£2.4k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Modern .gov</td> <td>£1.2k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MitreFinch (access mgt)</td> <td>£1.4k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Redbox (Recording)</td> <td>£2k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wax (e-procurement)</td> <td>£5.6k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Visual Files (Legal)</td> <td>£1.2k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>View City</td> <td>£3k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Misc Small Contracts</td> <td>£16k</td> </tr> </table>	Firewall Costs * Council Security	£28k	Sonus Voice appliance support	£4k	Off Site Backup and storage	£4k	AutoCAD	£10k	Carevision	£1k	Adobe	£1k	Cipfa (FinanceMgt)	£0.6k	Express (Elections)	£3.6k	Home Finder	£2.4k	Modern .gov	£1.2k	MitreFinch (access mgt)	£1.4k	Redbox (Recording)	£2k	Wax (e-procurement)	£5.6k	Visual Files (Legal)	£1.2k	View City	£3k	Misc Small Contracts	£16k	
Firewall Costs * Council Security	£28k																																			
Sonus Voice appliance support	£4k																																			
Off Site Backup and storage	£4k																																			
AutoCAD	£10k																																			
Carevision	£1k																																			
Adobe	£1k																																			
Cipfa (FinanceMgt)	£0.6k																																			
Express (Elections)	£3.6k																																			
Home Finder	£2.4k																																			
Modern .gov	£1.2k																																			
MitreFinch (access mgt)	£1.4k																																			
Redbox (Recording)	£2k																																			
Wax (e-procurement)	£5.6k																																			
Visual Files (Legal)	£1.2k																																			
View City	£3k																																			
Misc Small Contracts	£16k																																			

			<p>IT Managed Services - £86k increased contract costs:</p> <p>Rev and Ben (Iworld) – £20k Parking £5k Web Hosting £14k SAP £47k</p> <p>Colleagues in Strategic Procurement, Finance and Digital services are happy to meet with members to provide a more informed briefing as to how contracts are managed across the Council; of which digital services have approx. 300 contracts.</p>	
Table 7.2c	Management Actions (page 56 of agenda pack)	The Committee noted that under Environment & Resident Experience for 2025/26, there was an overspend of £35k predicted and requested details on the reason for this.	Response: Officers are unable to ascertain where this £35k projected overspend came from.	
EN_SAV_004	Events income increases	The Committee requested further details on how these savings would be achieved and clarification on the reasons for the variation in the	Response: the figure of £124k shown in column N doesn't appear to be correct as columns G to J suggest the saving required as only £50k and, as that's on track, its RAG rating is green. The expectation is that the number of events in parks (and therefore the income stream) will continue to grow over time. The two new (job-share) Assistant Directors for Culture will be leading on encouraging growth in cultural events in parks.	

		savings target in each of the years over the MTFS period and whether these targets were realistic and achievable.														
E&RE	Growth of £946k for the delivery of the Leisure Management Service in-house	The Committee requested a breakdown of the expected extra costs.	Response: OSC received clarification of the financial components of the Cabinet’s decision on 5 th December 2023 to insource leisure management, during the exempt part of the OSC Call-In meeting on 3 rd January. The information disclosed in that exempt part of the meeting cannot be shared in the public domain.													
EN24_SAV_003	Enhance enforcement on environmental crime	The Committee requested that details be provided of the estimated cost of hiring more permanent staff to enhance enforcement action compared to the proposed approach of entering into a partnership with a private contractor	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>in-house</th> <th>Commission Based Contract</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Staffing costs to Council</td> <td>£460k</td> <td>Nil (Cost neutral to the Council)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Processing costs of FPNs</td> <td>X1 member of staff (£31k)</td> <td>Nil (Contained within the contract)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Retention of FPNs Income based on 1000 fines</td> <td>c.£170K (1000 FPNs p/a)</td> <td>c£750K (1000 FPNs p/w)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			in-house	Commission Based Contract	Staffing costs to Council	£460k	Nil (Cost neutral to the Council)	Processing costs of FPNs	X1 member of staff (£31k)	Nil (Contained within the contract)	Retention of FPNs Income based on 1000 fines	c.£170K (1000 FPNs p/a)	c£750K (1000 FPNs p/w)
	in-house	Commission Based Contract														
Staffing costs to Council	£460k	Nil (Cost neutral to the Council)														
Processing costs of FPNs	X1 member of staff (£31k)	Nil (Contained within the contract)														
Retention of FPNs Income based on 1000 fines	c.£170K (1000 FPNs p/a)	c£750K (1000 FPNs p/w)														

		<p>to carry out the additional enforcement action.</p>				<p>Response: The service will cover litter, often associated with smoking, eating and drinking, that are improperly discarded and left by members of the public; or are spilt during business operations as well as waste management operations. The contractors are service industry experts and the additional resource allows for existing staff to focus on more complicated and involved interventions/investigations, whilst the commissioned based contractor are on street 95% of the time and able to issue more FPNs.</p> <p>In summary, we will see a net increase in the number of FPNs served if we had a commission based contract as our operational costs are higher than the commission based contractor, which is cost neutral to the Council.</p> <p>Follow up request from 18th January: The Members requested a further explanation of why issuing FPNS in the private sector generates significant revenue but doing it in house means it would be a net £290k cost to the Council. The members wanted further assurances about the underlying assumptions of this and how realistic they were. The difference can't just be because the Council pays its staff more. Why couldn't an in-house team generate more revenue (the difference between the two models was more than four times as much)</p> <p>The Members also wanted an explanation of what the appeals process would be for a resident who was fined by a private contractor.</p> <p>Follow-up Response: The private sector had better technology and systems as this area is their sole business and work is undertaken nationally. In addition, they will predominantly be based on street and all</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>back-office functions are undertaken centrally. Therefore, there is less need to come back to the office to undertake additional processing/paperwork.</p> <p>See the flowchart appended to this document summarising the representation process* and the below link to representations on the Haringey website Pay or challenge a dumped rubbish penalty notice Haringey Council.</p>										
336	New River Sports & Fitness	The Committee requested further explanation of the self-financing of this scheme.	<p>Response: Service Officers queried whether there has been some conflation with the additional income set out in the new revenue saving EN24_SAV_004.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="969 539 1861 676"> <tr> <td data-bbox="969 539 1003 676">EN24_SAV_004</td> <td data-bbox="1003 539 1424 676">The New River Sports Centre has an operational subsidy of £170,000 (Total subsidy of £225k - £54k central recharges). This proposal seeks to realise savings by : Reviewing concessionary discounts; Reducing enery usage through technological improvements;Increase customer base through equipment upgrades and additional activities.</td> <td data-bbox="1424 539 1491 676">E&N</td> <td data-bbox="1491 539 1559 676">-53</td> <td data-bbox="1559 539 1626 676">-40</td> <td data-bbox="1626 539 1693 676">-34</td> <td data-bbox="1693 539 1760 676">-26</td> <td data-bbox="1760 539 1827 676">-17</td> <td data-bbox="1827 539 1861 676">-170</td> </tr> </table> <p>In relation to the new revenue saving identified for New River, there will be a £40k saving on electricity which will be achieved by swapping out all the floodlights / external lighting to LED, supported by some local energy production and battery storage. This requires capital investment, the money for which is in the capital budget. £99k of new income streams over the five years, achieved by increasing the range of activities on site, including things like functions and events through to having Amazon lockers on site. The balancing £31k comes from an above inflation fees and charges increase of 1.2% to raise additional revenue within what we think is the commercial envelope for customers.</p>	EN24_SAV_004	The New River Sports Centre has an operational subsidy of £170,000 (Total subsidy of £225k - £54k central recharges). This proposal seeks to realise savings by : Reviewing concessionary discounts; Reducing enery usage through technological improvements;Increase customer base through equipment upgrades and additional activities.	E&N	-53	-40	-34	-26	-17	-170	
EN24_SAV_004	The New River Sports Centre has an operational subsidy of £170,000 (Total subsidy of £225k - £54k central recharges). This proposal seeks to realise savings by : Reviewing concessionary discounts; Reducing enery usage through technological improvements;Increase customer base through equipment upgrades and additional activities.	E&N	-53	-40	-34	-26	-17	-170					

			Finance have advised that the funding assumption for this scheme is that the capital investment will generate savings/income over the cost of the investment, so it is considered to be self-financing.																									
401	Tottenham Hale Green Space	Noting that there were considerable S106 contributions for this area following large scale development, the Committee requested details on what proportion of Haringey Council funding and S106 funding was being used to support this mixed-funded programme of green space improvements.	<p>The updated Scheme 401 across all years is as per the below table. This does not include any further Dec 23/Jan 24 adjustments. Prior to 2023/24 the scheme included Down Lane Park Improvement Programme (this is now a separate capital scheme – 405). Scheme 401 comprises the following projects: Central Rail Bridge; Ferry Lane; Project Management (salaries) Park View Underpass; and The Paddock.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="7">Total Budget</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Capital Scheme 23/24 with DLP moved</th> <th>LBH Capital (£)</th> <th>SDP Land Receipts (£)</th> <th>S106 (£)</th> <th>S278 (£)</th> <th>GLA grant (£)</th> <th>Unfunded (currently)</th> <th>TOTAL (£'000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>401 Tottenham Hale Green and Open Spaces</td> <td>3,671,700</td> <td>1,529,000</td> <td>831,000</td> <td>29,750</td> <td>0</td> <td>3,208,000</td> <td>9,269,450</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Section 106 funding for the scheme is £831k.</p>		Total Budget							Capital Scheme 23/24 with DLP moved	LBH Capital (£)	SDP Land Receipts (£)	S106 (£)	S278 (£)	GLA grant (£)	Unfunded (currently)	TOTAL (£'000)	401 Tottenham Hale Green and Open Spaces	3,671,700	1,529,000	831,000	29,750	0	3,208,000	9,269,450	
	Total Budget																											
Capital Scheme 23/24 with DLP moved	LBH Capital (£)	SDP Land Receipts (£)	S106 (£)	S278 (£)	GLA grant (£)	Unfunded (currently)	TOTAL (£'000)																					
401 Tottenham Hale Green and Open Spaces	3,671,700	1,529,000	831,000	29,750	0	3,208,000	9,269,450																					
457	Future High Street Project	The Committee requested details on what proportion of Haringey Council funding and developer/S106	Response: The total budget of £4,081,000 is made up of LBH borrowing – £2.244m and FHSF (grant funding) – £1.836m. There is no contribution from s106.																									

		funding was being used to support this mixed-funded programme of infrastructure improvements.		
--	--	---	--	--

Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel				
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)
Service Growth - Existing		In relation to the proposal on funding for Connected Communities in Appendix 4, the Panel noted that the information provided was limited and requested that more substantive details be provided.	<p>Response: This is an existing item approved in March 2023 in agreeing the MTFS for 2023/24, see below extract from budget papers</p> <p>Connected Communities Funding of core and project – based service activity aligned with council wide transformation programmes. This service provides resident engagement, frontline support to establish the Localities working at place and neighbourhood, resident facing resettlement work and growing portfolio of VCS development & coordination and Health integration initiatives.</p>	

			<p>Follow up from OSC on 18th Jan: The Panel request more information about the £1m budget growth for 2024/25 (shown in Appendix 4) and what specifically that would be funding.</p> <p>Response: Officers have advised that this growth is to all to meet staff costs associated with the project.</p>	
AHC24_SAV_010	Continuing Healthcare	Further evidence to be provided to demonstrate that these savings could be achieved.	<p>Response: At present Haringey is well outside of the national average for those who are in receipt of continuing health care (CHC) funding. The national average is 92.15 per 100,000 with Haringey currently at 26 per 100,000. Not only does this provide potential high-level savings through health taking their legally required funding responsibility of cases but it also ensures residents are accessing the right level of support and that they are not being charged as CHC is not financially assessed where adult social care is.</p> <p>One of the alarming trends families have reported is that people with full <u>NHS Continuing Healthcare funding</u> – whose needs have not reduced and are not likely to – are having their funding downgraded to a joint package of care.</p> <p>The impact of this is, of course, that the local authority element of the funding will be means-tested, and the Local Authority will have to find the financial resources to fund a package of care over which they likely had little commissioning input when the package was first put in place by health.</p> <p>Other families report having NHS Continuing Healthcare assessments that show eligibility for full NHS Continuing Healthcare funding, and yet they're given a joint package of care instead.</p>	

			<p>There are a range of reasons as to why current numbers are as low as they are with anecdotal evidence from within the Adult Social Care workforce stating that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not the inhouse 'expertise' available to fully understand and support residents through the CHC process. • There is an inherent reluctance to challenge CHC decisions through a misunderstanding of what can and cannot be challenged. • The continuing healthcare team within the NHS have limited resources to complete assessments and a reluctance to accept referrals from community and social care staff. <p>It needs to be underscored that Continuing Healthcare operates under a different legal framework to the Care Act 2014, and so further expertise is needed for Haringey to maximise transfers of funding in this area. To this end a project team has been set up to lead on this activity.</p> <p>20 of the top 100 cases transferred over for either joint or full funding, we would be able to save between 1.1m-1.6m.</p> <p>The project team setup has been tasked with achieving these savings.</p> <p>A programme of work has commenced in Haringey which provides the knowledge and experience to support achieving better health outcomes for our residents. To further support this work local authorities across NCL are working together to change inequalities in this area.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

AHC24_SAV_012	Strength Based Working	The Panel was informed that costs were being reduced through assistive technology and strength-based approaches and that data was available to support this. Relevant data to be provided.	Response: See the explanation and tables appended to this document **.	
AHC24_SAV_012	Strength Based Working	On the issue of locality working, the Panel requested details of support groups available in each of the three locality areas in the Borough.	Response: This is currently being mapped out with our health care colleagues and we will have this finalised by the beginning of March. A piece of work is underway with Haricare and this will be integrated into our locality model.	
AHC24_SAV_015	Service Audit	The Panel suggested that question marks remained over the large, estimated size of the proposed saving and requested more detailed information about how these would be achieved.	Response: This is currently on target and the savings have almost been achieved.	

Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel				
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)
<u>New Savings Proposals</u>				
AHC24_SAV_003	Use of one bed social housing as temporary accommodation for families with a baby or young children	<p>The Panel notes that this appears to be a repeat saving from last year and requests clarification about how the savings put forward in this year's budget proposals relate to last year's. The panel are unsure whether councillors are being asked to agree a saving, which was already agreed to last year, or whether this is a new request.</p> <p>The Panel request assurances about the extent to which the corresponding savings from last year have been achieved/were on track.</p>	<p>Response: AHC24_SAV_003 is a repeat of last year's savings proposal, AHC_SAV_007 and not a new saving The panel are being asked to agree the same.</p> <p>The original overall target for 22/23 and 23/24 was to achieve 45 lets to new TA from social housing stock, but only 10 had been let. The Target delivery has therefore been revised to 30 Lets for delivery in 24/25 and 25/26.</p> <p>Follow up Action from OSC on 18th Jan: There was a process question around the process of why Members were seemingly being asked to confirm a saving that was put forward in last year's budget. It's a 5 year MTFS and this doesn't usually happen.</p> <p>The response confirms that AHC_SAV_003, 006 & 007 are identical to AHC_SAV_007, 009 & 010 on the savings tracker that were agreed last year. The amounts are the same with the column for</p>	

			<p>the current year deleted. The savings are green on the tracker and don't appear to be in the table of written off savings, so Members want assurances that these haven't been double counted.</p> <p>Follow-up response: The saving was double counted in error. This has been corrected. An improvement in Council tax base, after December report, has mitigated the impact this double counting had in the budget.</p>	
AHC24_SAV_006	A Project Officer will be engaged to work with families to remove any barriers to moving on from temporary accommodation.	<p>The Panel notes that this appears to be a repeat saving from last year and requests clarification about how the savings put forward in this year's budget proposals relate to last year's. The panel are unsure whether councillors are being asked to agree a saving, which was already agreed to last year, or whether this is a new request.</p> <p>The Panel request assurances about the extent to which the corresponding savings from last year have been achieved/were on track.</p>	<p>Response: AHC24_SAV_006 is a repeat of last year's proposal AHC_SAV_009. Not a new saving. The panel are being asked to agree the same.</p> <p>Both proposals assumed 180 lets to pre-localism families in TA (those whose applied before 9th November 2012 and was based on several large-scale new build schemes being delivered within the year and the voids programme delivery. While some progress has been made this year (40 lets) it has not been on the scale expected as schemes have been delayed. As a result, savings of approximately £162k have been realised to date but we are unlikely to reach target. Subject to performance in 24/25 we may look to extend the project into 25/26.</p>	

			<p>Follow up Action from OSC on 18th Jan: The response confirms that AHC_SAV_006 is identical to AHC_SAV_009 on the savings tracker that were agreed last year. The amounts are the same with the column for the current year deleted. The savings are green on the tracker and don't appear to be in the table of written off savings, so Members want assurances that this saving hasn't been double counted.</p> <p>Follow-up response: The saving was double counted in error. This has been corrected. An improvement in Council tax base, after December report, has mitigated the impact this double counting had in the budget.</p>	
AHC24_SAV_007	<p>Converting leases to Homes for Haringey in order to charge full LHA subsidy rates.</p>	<p>The Panel notes that this appears to be a repeat saving from last year and requests clarification about how the savings put forward in this year's budget proposals relate to last year's. The panel are unsure whether councillors are being asked to agree a saving, which was already agreed to last year, or whether this is a new request.</p> <p>The Panel request assurances about the extent to which the corresponding</p>	<p>Response: AHC24_SAV_007 is not a new proposal and mirror last year's proposal AHC_SAV_010. The panel are being asked to agree the same.</p> <p>Progress against targets is steady. From April to November, there has been 18 lease completions against a target of 31. The target is expected to be met.</p> <p>Further Action from OSC on 18th Jan: The response confirms that AHC_SAV_007 are identical to AHC_SAV_010 on the savings tracker that were agreed last year. The amounts are the same with the column for the current year deleted. The savings are green on the tracker and don't appear to be in the table of written off savings, so</p>	

		savings from last year have been achieved/were on track.	<p>Members want assurances that this hasn't been double counted.</p> <p>Follow-up response: The saving was double counted in error. This has been corrected. An improvement in Council tax base, after December report, has mitigated the impact this double counting had in the budget.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

* The process chart showing the Representation Process for Fixed Penalty Notices is set out on the next page.

** The response to the query on Strength Based Working (Adults & Health - AHC24_SAV_012) is set out on the following pages.