

Overview & Scrutiny Committee (Corporate, CS&E and E&RE)					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Cabinet to agree not agree/partially agree recommendation
<u>General Issues</u>					
Recommendation 1 Culture, Strategy & Engagement	2023/24 Outturn Position & 2024/25 Budget Position	None	Noting the particular budget pressures relating to Digital and IT services and that this was exacerbated by the higher levels of insourced services in recent years, the Panel recommended that all knock-on costs associated with insourcing should be budgeted for over the longer-term at the time when that decision is made.	Yes response to be added below	Agree
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 1	The Cabinet agrees and it should be noted that the MTFS makes provision for such costs in preparation for the Leisure Management insourcing, for example.				
Recommendation 2 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 insourcing costs as above),	The Committee noted the response to this but considered that this was a high spend area of the council and continued to request that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee receive a report on the causes of increasing contract costs in a consolidated report.	Yes response to be added below	Agreed

the Panel requested a breakdown of these costs.

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 indexation linked to

		<p>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>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 2</p>	<p>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 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="367 1201 1021 1310"> <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>					Firewall Costs * Council Security	£28k	Sonus Voice appliance support	£4k	Off Site Backup and storage	£4k
Firewall Costs * Council Security	£28k										
Sonus Voice appliance support	£4k										
Off Site Backup and storage	£4k										

	<p>IT Managed service Contracts for Maintenance (Managed on behalf of Services) - £50k increased contract costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rev and Ben (Iworld) – £20k Parking £5k Web Hosting £14k SAP £47k <p>Officers from Strategic Procurement, Finance and Digital services could 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>
--	---

MTFS Savings Tracker

Recommendation 3	Full cost recovery of matchday cleansing service	None	The Committee considered the use of Council taxpayers funds to meet the costs of matchday cleansing services to be unacceptable and recommended that the Council continues to urgent pursue negotiations with Tottenham Hotspur Football Club to secure full cost recovery of all matchday cleansing service,	Yes – response to be added below	Agreed
PL20/9					

			including recovery of funds retrospectively for costs incurred in previous years since the opening of the new stadium.		
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 3	For all major football and non football events, THFC undertakes an element of its own cleansing activities within the immediate surrounding areas. The level of resource provided by THFC is currently under discussion as the Council is still providing cleansing resources over and above cleansing carried out by THFC to ensure the area around the stadium is cleansed to an acceptable level of cleanliness pre, during and post matches.				
Recommendation 4 N/A	Digital Together	None.	The Committee noted that this proposal involved a substantive sum of money but that over 90% of the savings in 2023/24 had not yet been achieved. The Committee further noted that the savings needed to be achieved on a cross-cutting basis with all service departments adopting more efficient systems and processes. The Committee recommended that the Cabinet explain how each service department will be engaging with this proposal in order to achieve the savings over the MTFS period.	Yes Response to be added below	Agreed
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 4	The Council has struggled to make this saving historically for a number of reasons – a lack of a pipeline of automation ideas and projects, a lack of the requisite skills in-house to develop new systems and processes, and a lack of an incentive for service departments to offer up processes to create the pipeline in the first place. The first has begun to be created as a result of Budget Fortnight. An initial team has been created to address the second and the restructure underway in Digital Services will build sufficient capacity for the longer-term. A proposal will be brought forward for how the savings can be achieved over the period with all service departments incentivised to play their part, following engagement with services and senior management.				

Children and Young People's Panel – Children's Services					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed/ Not Agreed/ Partially agreed
Recommendation 5		None	<p>The Panel was concerned about the budget gap of £16.4M reported in the draft MTFS and the fact that no further information is available at this stage on where further savings will be coming from.</p> <p>The Panel seeks assurances from Cabinet that it will seek to protect key non statutory services within Children's Services from any further cuts.</p>	Yes – response to be added below	Agreed
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 5	Children's services always works within the council to ensure that we continue providing services within the budget envelope. At the time of writing, members will know that the proposed 2024/25 Budget is balanced, however there				

	are still significant financial challenges ahead therefore no part of the council can be protected through our continued drive to reduce down costs.
--	--

Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed/ Not Agreed/Partially agreed
<u>General Issues</u>					
Recommendation 6 N/A		None	The Panel seeks assurances from Cabinet that the pressures on the Adult Social Care budget would not impact negatively on the quality of care as new contracts were negotiated.	Yes response to be added below	Agreed

Cabinet Response to Recommendation 6	Haringey is committed to paying sustainable fee rates and fee rates are negotiated on this basis. Haringey's recently launched adult social care Quality Assurance and Contract Monitoring Framework will ensure regular contract monitoring and quality assurance and on-site provider visits. This will enable a more proactive approach to addressing and resolving contractual performance and quality assurance issues.
---	--

Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed / Not Agreed/ Partially Agreed
<u>Request for Additional Investment</u>					
Recommendation 7	Additional investment in landscaping and green space maintenance on new build developments	<p>The Panel request clarification about whether additional funding for maintaining communal green spaces in our new housing developments could come out of the HRA, rather than the revenue budget, which is facing significant pressures.</p> <p>Response: The HRA is the revenue budget for Housing. Additional landscaping works would come out of the HRA budget, rather than the GF revenue budget.</p>	<p>The Panel welcomes the standard of landscaping and green space provision that has been put in place for our new build housing developments.</p> <p>The Panel would like to see additional investment put into maintaining the high standard of landscaping, so that it does not fall into disrepair or become overgrown. Given the amount of investment the Council has put into its housebuilding programme, maintaining the surrounding green spaces is an important part of their upkeep and ensuring those sites are attractive.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to securing additional resources to undertake additional maintenance of communal green spaces on new developments, including cutting back overgrown foliage, weeding and maintaining flower beds.</p>	Yes – cabinet Response to be added below	Partially Agreed

Cabinet Response to Recommendation 7	The Council is currently reviewing its arrangements for the management of new build housing. Maintaining the high quality green spaces that have been developed will be an important consideration in new arrangements moving forwards. However, given the incredibly constrained environment the HRA is operating in, there is unlikely to be additional funding committed in this area.
---	---

Climate, Community Safety and Culture Scrutiny Panel						
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed Not Agreed Partially Agreed	
<u>New Savings Proposals</u>						
Recommendation 8 CSE24_SAV_003	The proposal is to stop providing hard copy newspapers and magazines in libraries. Newspapers and magazines are now available on Pressreader which provides thousands of newspapers and	None	Given the impact the proposed savings would have on elderly citizens and citizens accessing papers in community languages together with the social benefits that this provision of hard copy newspapers provided, the Panel recommended that this saving not be taken forward.	Yes – Cabinet Response to be added below	Partially Agreed	

	<p>magazines from around the globe. Many library services that stopped newspapers and magazines during COVID lockdown have not reintroduced them.</p>				
<p>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 8</p>	<p>We will seek to identify a limited number of hard copy titles that can be retained within existing resources, based on usage.</p> <p>It is worth noting that Press Reader enables residents to read many more titles, including those from around the world, than we would ever be able to stock in hard copy, and this is particularly valuable for residents for whom English is not their first language.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 9 CSE24_SAV_001</p>	<p>The use of our libraries varies from one branch to another at different time of the day. Based on footfall analysis we know that library use is typically lowest in mornings. Young people in particular have a need for study space in the evenings and libraries are ideal as a free and safe community space. We want to look at varying the opening hours of our libraries to times when they are</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>The Panel would like Cabinet to reconsider this saving. The Panel would not like to see any reduction in Library opening hours and the net saving found from elsewhere.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Not agreed</p>

<p>most heavily used, which could include later in the evenings, allowing us to allocate resources in a more targeted way. Library buildings and facilities could be made available to other services even when the library service itself is not operating e.g., Community Hub teams and VCS organisations. The proposed saving is based on reviewing hours at the six branch libraries with a mixture of mornings and afternoons opening times based on demand and demographics, to ensure libraries remain accessible to all. The service is currently carrying some vacancies and agency cover which will reduce the need for any proposed redundancies. No library building would be closed.</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

Response to Recommendation 9	<p>Cabinet recognises the value that libraries have for our communities, however the scale of the financial challenge we face reduces our options. Significant savings are already being found in other services as well, and we have to ensure we can meet our statutory obligations, including those to the most vulnerable, as well as set a balanced budget.</p> <p>We have already started engaging with Friends of Libraries groups on behalf of local users on the options and will be discussing detailed proposals on the changes to opening hours for each library with them.</p>				
Recommendation 10 CSE24_SAV_001	As above		<p>If library opening hours were reduced, the Cabinet should give assurance that it intended to engage robustly with schools, early years users, and local groups to explore options on how to keep Library buildings open at the appropriate times for these users. Also, to provide more information on ‘wrap around’ services that could be provided in Library buildings from other council services outside of the Library opening times.</p> <p>The Cabinet response should also indicate if the service had considered other ways to generate income into libraries by potentially looking at hiring out spaces before putting this saving forward.</p>	Yes, to be set out below	Agreed

Cabinet Response to Recommendation 10	<p>We have already started engaging with Friends of Libraries groups on behalf of local users on the options and will be discussing detailed proposals on the changes to opening hours for each library with them.</p> <p>The proposal to develop Community Hubs elsewhere in the final MTFS report presents opportunities for other services to be delivered from library buildings, including advice services, preventative outreach services and early years.</p> <p>The Library service already has an income target of more than £400k a year, which it has historically struggled to achieve, even before Covid-19. This year we are closer to achieving it than in any previous year, thanks to the significant efforts by staff and the capital investment into branches to improve accessibility and lettings.</p> <p>We will continue to work on income generation as a priority and as part of the proposed new libraries strategy.</p>				
Recommendation 11 CSE24_SAV_001			<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recognise the need to make savings to balance the budget and that there are not easy savings to make and not making this associated saving will have an impact on other areas of the budget. Assurance is sought from Cabinet on measures to mitigate impact of reduced library hours on service users including that, individually, the libraries remain open at times of the highest usage and each library is assessed, on a case by case basis, to understand what this peak user time is. Also ensuring that the library opening times are compiled in a way that allows a user to use a library</p>	Yes to be set out below	Agreed

			that is in reasonable close reach, if one local library is not open when they need to use it.		
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 11	<p>We have already started engaging with Friends of Libraries groups on behalf of local users on the options and will be discussing detailed proposals on the changes to opening hours for each library with them.</p> <p>We will be looking at usage and footfall data to ensure we keep libraries open at the times of highest usage.</p> <p>We are exploring a neighbourhood cluster approach that will maximise the availability of library opening hours within reasonable reach even if the most local library is not open when a resident wants to use it.</p>				
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	<u>Agreed/</u> <u>Not Agreed</u> <u>Partially Agreed</u>
<u>Format of budget scrutiny papers</u>					
Recommendation 12	N/A	None	<p>The Committee welcomed the updated format of the budget scrutiny papers and requested the following updates for future years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A short piece of introductory text for each table (in the main report) to explain how they related to one another. b) Additional explanatory text on the capital budget appendix, including the 	Yes to be set out below	Agreed

		<p>In the budget compilation exercise, there had been an assessment of capital schemes that: had a risk of not being self-financing and</p>	<p>impact on the revenue budget in terms of interest incurred.</p> <p>c) Additional discussions between the Assistant Director for Finance and the Chair of the Housing, Planning & Development Scrutiny Panel on the format of appendices and reports for this Panel.</p> <p>d) Concerning the agreed capital expenditure programme, where there are mixed sources of funding supporting a scheme, this should be set out more fully and in more detail.</p> <p>e) Reductions in the Capital Programme should be set out separately in a tabular format, rather than being embedded in the MTFS report. The table should include brief information on the individual scheme and the impact it has on the Council's aims and ambitions. The table should further indicate</p>			
--	--	---	---	--	--	--

		<p>those which were not deemed essential, and projects that could be re-profiled, resulting in £400m reduction in borrowing for capital that could in future years impact on the General Fund and have revenue implications. Information on this was embedded in the MTFS report</p>	<p>whether the decision involves a reduction in the scope of a particular program with figures included or whether this is a capital scheme that has been discontinued; making clear whether it was a particular line that was in the capital budget in the previous year and has now been deleted.</p>			
<p>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 12</p>	<p>It is recognised that the MTFS is by its nature a complex paper describing a huge range of financial planning changes made necessary by national and local developments. Officers continually strive to make the report as understandable and comprehensive as they can supplemented by appropriate briefings. Officers have sort to address useful feedback from Overview and Scrutiny in this and previous cycles and will do so again in the production of next years report.</p>					

