

Corporate Priority 1

Enable every child to have the best start in life, with high quality Education

Ref	Proposal	2017-18 £000's	2018-19 £000's	2019-20 £000's	2020-21 £000's	2021-22 £000's	Total £000's	Current Budget	Current Staff	Delivery Risk RAG
1.1	Service Redesign and Workforce	300	150	-	-	-	450	10,601	545	Amber
1.2	Early Help & Targeted Response	62	100				162	12,583	47	Amber
1.3	Family Group Conferencing	200	100	-	-	-	300	30	n/a	Green
1.4	Family Based Placements	100	175	-	-	-	275	12,583	147	Amber
1.5	Care Leavers - Semi Independent Living	25	75	-	-	-	100	1,699	147	Amber
1.6	Adoption and Special Guardianship Order payments	150	148	310	-	-	608	2,739	147	Amber
1.7	New Models of Care		1,000				1,000	pooled budgets	pooled workforce	Red
	Total	2,762	1,748	310	-	-	4,820			

Corporate Priority 3

A clean and safe borough where people are proud to live

3.1	Charge Green waste - income generation	375	375				750	N/A	N/A	Amber
3.2	Charging for Bulky Household Waste	300	100				400	N/A	N/A	Green
3.3	Charging for Replacement Wheelie Bins	100	50				150	N/A	N/A	Green
3.4	Charging for recycling bins and increasing residual bins for RSLs, Managing Agents, Developers etc...	50	50				100	N/A	N/A	Green
3.5	Flats Above Shops -Provision of bags - Service reduction	120					120	N/A	N/A	Green
3.5	Reduce Outreach/ Education team - Service reduction	50	65				115	N/A	N/A	Green
3.6	Closure of Park View Road R&R - Service reduction	115	115				230	N/A	N/A	Green
3.7	Veolia Operational Efficiencies	200					200	N/A	N/A	Green
3.7	Rationalisation of Parking Visitor Permits	125	225				350	N/A	N/A	Green
3.8	Relocation of Parking/CCTV processes and appeals		380				380	N/A	13	Amber
3.9	Sustainable Transport in CO2 Parking Permit Charge	100	300				400	N/A	N/A	Green
	Total	1,535	1,660	-	-	-	3,195			

Corporate Priority 1

Enable every child to have the best start in life, with high quality Education

Ref	Proposal	2017-18 £000's	2018-19 £000's	2019-20 £000's	2020-21 £000's	2021-22 £000's	Total £000's	Current Budget	Current Staff	Delivery Risk RAG
Corporate Priority X		Enabling								
6.1	Shared Service Centre - new delivery model for shared services		250	1,500	1,500		3,250	9,025	336	Green
6.2	Alexandra House - Decant		250	750			1,000	n/a	n/a	Green
6.3	Closure of internal Print Room		51				51	1,364	22	Green
	Total		551	2,250	1,500	-	4,301			
	Overall Total (Pre-Agreed) Savings		3,959	2,560	1,500	-	12,316			

Children's Services - Service Redesign and Workforce

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Children's Services
Responsible Officer:	Director of Children's Services
Reference:	Children's Services - Service Redesign and Workforce
Type of saving:	Efficiency saving/service redesign
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
In relation to the contact service this will impact on parents and carers in need of using the service.	More responsive service which will contribute to a more timely service for this cohort
In relation to the Independent Reviewing Service this will impact on the looked after children cohorts	A greater level of independence from the service should ensure better outcomes for looked after children
In relation to the front door assessment proposal, this should impact on families accessing social care services	Ensuring that only those families in need of social care services are in receipt of them, rather than engaging with families that do not meet the threshold for intervention.

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: A number of pieces of work are included within this proposal which together contribute to savings across the workforce. This includes:</p> <p>Contact Service Reconfiguration of the service based around typical contact need (sessional evening & weekend) in order to reduce the cost of contact per hour, alongside the introduction of a rota system which enables a reduction of</p> <p>Independent Reviewing Officers This function is currently provided in-house and could be externally commissioned to yield savings. This would also enable a much greater level of independent challenge, supporting the delivery of better outcomes for our looked after children. This proposal will also enable a greater level of accountability across this function which would be set out within the procurement and contract process.</p> <p>Reduction in Agency Spend Actively reduce the levels of agency by converting posts to permanent staff alongside developing a strong retention strategy to ensure this is a sustainable proposal.</p> <p>Service Redesign It is proposed that we redesign our services, as a consequence of managing demand into social care, which will enable the service to appropriately reduce the workforce to better meet need.</p> <p>This proposal will be delivered by ensuring that only those that require social care services are assessed, based upon the Thresholds of Need partnership document.</p> <p>Those that are provided with support will receive it in a more timely and effective way, through the implementation of new practice tools which strengthen our work with families. This will also enable cases to be progressed through</p>

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data £000	Employees	Workforce Data
Current budget	10,601		545
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	300	Year 1	10
Year 2	150	Year 2	30
Year 3	0	Year 3	
Year 4	0	Year 4	
Year 5	0	Year 5	
Total	450	Total	40

Rationale

Contact Service

At present the service delivers contact across the year at £81 per hour. However contact is typically required after school, during the evenings or at weekends and there is an opportunity to reduce the hourly unit cost by reconfiguring the service so that workforce availability is matched to service need

Independent Reviewing Officers

This is a statutory requirement and a number of other local authorities have externally commissioned the service to release workforce savings. Some initial analysis has indicated that a new delivery model could provide a £100k saving.

Reduction in Agency Spend

Although there have been some success in efforts to reduce the number of agency by recruiting permanent staff over 16/17, there is a need to continue this work in order to build a robust and sustainable workforce whilst releasing savings across 17/18.

Service Redesign

By more effectively managing demand, a reduction in the workforce could be delivered which would better meet need. This would mean that by ensuring that only those that require social care services are assessed, practitioners can more effectively focus upon families who need a service. Those that are provided with support will receive it in a more timely way, through the implementation of new practice tools which strengthen and support our work with families. This will also enable cases to be progressed through the system more efficiently.

Key benefits - financial and non-financial

Contact Service

Financial: £80k

Non-Financial: More flexible pool of resources for this function based upon need.

Independent Reviewing Officers

Financial: 100k

Non-Financial: Increased levels of independence and scrutiny as well a more flexible pool of resources

Reduction in Agency Spend

Financial: £120k

Non-Financial: More sustainable and robust workforce

Front Door Assessments

Financial: £150k

Non-Financial: Increase the timeliness of assessments and permanency planning

Internal dependencies and external constraints

- Commissioning and Procurement dependencies related to the IRO service
- Implementation of the Recruitment and Retention Strategy
- Market dependencies: Availability of permanent staff

Procurement strategy:

Yes - this saving includes a reduction of staff

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	300	150	0	0	0
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated	0	0			
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	300	150			0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	300	450	450	450	450
Payback Period: Not applicable					

Early Help & Targeted Response

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Early Help & Targeted Response
Responsible Officer:	AD Early Help & Prevention/Head of Targeted Response and Youth Justice
Reference:	Early Help
Type of saving:	New delivery model
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL	
Proposal:	<p>Through the implementation and delivery of the Targeted Response offer as part of the Early Help model it is anticipated that escalation in the number of Looked After Children would be prevented and the associated saving delivered. This will be as a consequence of enabling supporting families to remain together where possible.</p> <p>This work would also contribute to the prevention of further escalation of the number of looked after children, by providing the right support at an earlier point.</p> <p>This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct work with children and parents, - Improving school / home relationships and behaviour management approaches, - Supporting positive parental attitudes & behaviours as well as a range of other services which support assessment and decision making.
Rationale:	<p>We believe that children are best supported in strong and resilient families and want to promote this by offering a range of early help and targeted support services to enable families to do this where possible. This will decrease the demand for social care intervention, specifically for looked after children, whilst providing better outcomes for children and their families.</p>

Benefits:
Financial: £162k
Non-Financial: A reduction in children needing to become looked after.

Procurement strategy:
n/a

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Fewer Children and Young People in Care	Improve lives of children and young people

SUMMARY				
	Financial Data		Workforce Data	
	£000			£000
Base Data				
Current budget	12,583	Employees		47
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees		
	Year 1	62	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	100	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3	0	Year 3	
	Year 4	0	Year 4	
	Year 5	0	Year 5	
	Total	162	Total	0

Internal dependencies and external constraints:
none

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	62	100			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	62	100			
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	62	162	162	162	162
Payback Period: Not applicable					

Family Group Conferencing

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Looked After Children
Responsible Officer:	AD Safeguarding & Social Care/Head of Quality Assurance
Reference:	Family Group Conferencing
Type of saving:	New delivery model
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Fewer Children and Young People in Care	Improve lives of children and young people

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: This proposal relates to increasing the use of Family Group Conferences (FGC), to support those children who have just become looked after by the council or are on the edge of care, so that they can safely be returned home or remain with their families. This will enable better outcomes for families and also reduce the cost of placements.</p>
<p>Rationale: Haringey Council continues to experience high demand for statutory services, including a persistently high number of children and young people becoming Looked After. Whilst decision-making and application of thresholds have both been strengthened over the past 18 months, any further net reductions in Looked After Children (LAC) will require different forms of intervention with families before a child is accommodated. Family Group Conferencing is an internationally recognised evidence-based intervention, which originated in New Zealand, and has shown good results in diverting of children from coming from care and reduction in dependency on specialist services, by increasing family capacity to make decisions and increased resilience.</p>

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data £000	Workforce Data	
Current budget	30	Employees	n/a
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	200	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	100	Year 2	n/a
Year 3	0	Year 3	
Year 4	0	Year 4	
Year 5	0	Year 5	
Total	300	Total	0

Key benefits:

Phase 1 of this project delivers on the cross-cutting theme of Value for Money, by replacing the commissioned service with a new, tested provider.

Phase 2 is expected to have an immediate, measurable impact on reducing the length of time a proportion of children and young people remain in care who are currently represented in the social care Looked After Children numbers.

Phase 3: is expected to have medium term (2017/18), measurable impact on reducing the length of time a proportion of children and young people remain in care who are currently represented in the social care Looked After Children numbers. It will achieve this through three measurable benefits

- Decrease the number of children coming into care, with a focus on 15-17 age group
- Increase the number of children/young people returned home
- Reduce the number of short term placements (1week – 6months)

Phase 4 is expected to extend the outcomes from Phase 3 with further positive impacts on the number and duration of cases within other parts of the Children’s Social Care system, such as subject to Child in Need or Child Protection plans, and Care Leavers. It achieves this through delivering on two key cross-cutting themes from the Corporate Plan:

- Prevention and early intervention – supporting families to solve their problems before they become too entrenched and to reduce their need for statutory services.
- Working together with our communities – the Family Group conferences model supports wider Council efforts to build family and community resilience by giving a child’s wider network a central role in co-producing positive outcomes for the child.
- Providing better outcomes for young people within the criminal justice system

Internal dependencies and external constraints:

Dependent on having an appropriate Looked After Children cohort who would benefit from Family Group Conferences

Procurement strategy:

By May 2017 award a block contract for a Family Group Conferences supplier.

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated	330	160	0	0	0
Reduced benefits due to					
Additional Cost Estimated	130	60	0	0	0
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	200	100	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	200	300	300	300	300
Payback Period: 1 years					

Family Based Placements

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Looked After Children
Responsible Officer:	AD Safeguarding & Social Care/Head of Children in Care
Reference:	Family Based Placements
Type of saving:	Efficiency savings
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL

<p>Proposal:</p> <p>By increasing the range and type of in-house foster carers, alongside strengthening our Independent Fostering Agency arrangements, young people will be enabled to remain more locally, in appropriate family based placements which better meet their needs and achieve improved outcomes.</p> <p>An initial review had indicated that there are a small number of children currently in residential placements where we could deliver care closer to home, which would also be better value for money.</p> <p>This will mean that children and young people are provided with placements that better meet their needs as part of our ambition to deliver high quality care for our Looked After Children.</p> <p>Rationale: Analysis has indicated that by offering more family based placements, savings could be achieved, with a focus on those children who would most benefit from being appropriately stepped down into in-house foster care or Independent Fostering Agency.</p>

<p>Benefits:</p> <p>Financial: £275k</p> <p>Outcome: Will better meet the needs of Looked After Children more locally</p>
--

<p>Procurement strategy:</p> <p>A commissioning exercise would need to be undertaken with an Independent Fostering Agency.</p>

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Looked After Children cohort positively impacted via more appropriate care offer	Better permanency outcomes for Looked After Children

SUMMARY

	Financial Data	Workforce Data
Base Data	£000	
Current budget	12,583	147
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees
Year 1	100	Year 1 n/a
Year 2	175	Year 2 n/a
Year 3	0	Year 3
Year 4	0	Year 4
Year 5	0	Year 5
Total	275	0

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints:</p> <p>This saving is dependent on the availability of appropriate foster carers and Independent Fostering Agency arrangements</p>
--

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	100	175	0	0	0
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	100	175	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	100	275	275	275	275
Payback Period: not applicable					

Care Leavers: Semi-Independent Living

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Care Leavers
Responsible Officer:	AD Safeguarding & Social Care/Head of Children in Care
Reference:	Care Leavers: Semi-Independent Living
Type of saving:	Efficiency savings
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL

Proposal:
Review the current Semi Independent Living cohort and where appropriate, consider easing the transition to financial independence more efficiently, where care leavers have successfully been supported to live independently. This provision of support would remain in line with statistical neighbours and aligned with the Supporting Housing proposal.

Rationale:
The Leaving Care Service has a function to support the transition of living independently for care leavers. Analysis has suggested that an indepth review would identify cases where payments could be ceased and clarify for future.

Benefits:
Financial: £100k

Procurement strategy:
N/A

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Reducing dependence; building financial independence; careleavers living as other young people in the community but with support.	Improved independence for care leavers; better tenancy sustainment; higher employment rates for vulnerable young people.

SUMMARY

	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	1,699	Employees	147
Savings/Invest (up to)	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	25	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	75	Year 2	n/a
Year 3	0	Year 3	
Year 4	0	Year 4	
Year 5	0	Year 5	
Total	100	Total	0

Internal dependencies and external constraints:
None

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated	25	75			
Reduced benefits due to					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	25	75	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	25	100	100	100	100

Payback Period: Not applicable

Adoption and Special Guardianship Order Payments

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Permanency
Responsible Officer:	AD Safeguarding & Social Care/Head of Children in Care
Reference:	Adoption and Special Guardianship Order Payments
Type of saving:	Efficiency savings
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL

Proposal:

The proposal is based upon a review of support provision across adoption and Special Guardianship Orders, with a view to bringing the council in line with comparator boroughs and achieve savings through changes in the policy in three areas:

Payments for Adoptive Parents (£298k)

To refresh the payment policy for adoptive parents in order to reduce the spend in this area by limiting the length of time financial support is provided.

Special Guardianship Order Payments (£250k)

To refresh the payment policy for Special Guardianship Order payments in order to reduce spend in this area by making this by exception rather than a standard practice

Adoption Transport Allowances (£60k)

To review and refresh the adoption transport allowance in order to reduce spend in this area.

Rationale:

Payments for Adoptive Parents

Whilst it is common practice for support to be offered to adoptive parents this should be provided as an outcome of decisions following the financial capacity assessment. It is thought that by refreshing the policy and implementing it from April 2017, it is possible to reduce payments by having a clear process to follow which includes provision of assessed and time limited financial support.

Special Guardianship Order Payments

To refresh the payment policy for Special Guardianship Order payments in order to reduce spend in this area by making bringing payments in line with other local authorities. Initial analysis indicates that savings could be yielded by implementing these changes going forward but it would be highly challenging to do this retrospectively.

Adoption Transport Allowances

There is a need to review the transport payment offer for adoption as there are currently significant transport payments being made. Early analysis indicates that there could be a monthly saving once this expenditure is brought into line.

Benefits:

Financial: £608k

Procurement strategy:

n/a

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Financial implications for Adopters and guardians	Increased equitability of support

SUMMARY

	Financial Data		Workforce Data	
Base Data	£000			
Current budget	2,739	Employees	147	
Savings/Invest	£000		Change in employees	
(up to)	Year 1	150	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	148	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3	310	Year 3	n/a
	Year 4	0	Year 4	
	Year 5	0	Year 5	
	Total	608	Total	0

Internal dependencies and external constraints:

This saving is based upon implementation of policy changes

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	150	148	310	0	0
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	150	148	310	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	150	298	608	608	608
Payback Period: Not applicable					

New Models of Care

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Children's Social Care and Health
Responsible Officer:	Director of Children's Services/AD Commissioning/Director of Public Health
Reference:	New Models of Care
Type of saving:	New Delivery Model
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: There are potentially further savings achievable across Priority 1 through partnerships and joint working including: integration with Haringey CCG, development of an Accountable Care Partnership with Islington Council and both Haringey and Islington CCGs, transformation across North Central London cluster, and shared services with other authorities.</p> <p>These savings have not yet been quantified but we anticipate joint working will add at least £1m by 18/19 to the achievement of savings targets for P1.</p>
<p>Rationale: In the context of the MTFS, it is important that services explore opportunities to work together to improve service offer through integration and Value for Money.</p>

<p>Benefits: Financial: £1m</p>
--

<p>Procurement strategy: N/A</p>

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
More efficient pathways for accessing care	More efficient pathways for accessing care

SUMMARY				
Base Data	Financial Data	£000	Workforce Data	
Current budget	pooled budgets	Employees	pooled workforce	
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees		
(up to)	Year 1	0	Year 1	
	Year 2	1,000	Year 2	tbc
	Year 3	0	Year 3	
	Year 4	0	Year 4	
	Year 5	0	Year 5	
	Total	1,000	Total	0

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints:</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)		1000			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	1000			
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	1000	1000	1000	1000
Payback Period: n/a					

Green Waste Charging

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Green Waste Charging
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL	
Proposal:	Charging for Garden Waste: Stopping the current free weekly universal green waste collection service and reverting to a weekly opt in charged green waste collection service. The charge would be set at £75 per annum.
Rationale:	Green garden waste is household waste for which a charge can be made for the collection. The service will be paid for by those who opt in only rather than a contract cost which is funded universally by all residents.

Key benefits:
An estimate of £150K has been deducted and includes, call centre, IT development, container costs administration and any additional treatment/disposal costs. By charging for green waste and proposing that we provide composting bins 'at costs' we will be encouraging residents to deal with their waste sustainably at source.

Procurement strategy - N/A

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Free garden waste collection service stops	Resident satisfaction rates decrease
	Potential increase in fly tipping
	Reduction in recycling rate - 2%
	Potential greater contamination of Dry Recycling
	Increased side waste

SUMMARY				
	Financial Data		Workforce Data	
Base Data	£000			
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A	
Savings/Invest	£000		Change in employees	
	Year 1	375	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	375	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3		Year 3	
	Year 4		Year 4	
	Year 5		Year 5	
	Total	750	Total	0

Internal dependencies and external constraints:
Chargeable service will be fully administered by Veolia. Develop IT booking provision. Will need to complete a communications plan.

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	375	375			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	375	375	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	375	750	750	750	750
Payback Period: n/a					

Charge for Bulky Household Waste

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Charge for Bulky Household Waste
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Stopping a free bulk waste collection service to a	Fly tipping may increase
	Increased use of R & R
	Resident Satisfaction may be reduced
	Could increase side waste

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To move from a free bulk collection service for recyclables to a standard bulky waste collection service where a charge of £25 would be levied for the collection of up to 4 items plus £10 for each additional item.</p>
<p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 24 London boroughs charge for all bulky collections. - 10 offer some form of concession. - In North London – only Hackney and Waltham Forest also have some element of free bulky collections - Evidence from Newham saw a 75% reduction demand with no discernible increase in fly-tipping when they introduced a charge. - Modelled a 60% drop in demand for bulky collections from 30,850 p/a to 11500 p/a. <p>Impact on recycling rate will be low as material will still go to the bulk waste recycle facility at Edmonton.</p>

SUMMARY				
	Financial Data		Workforce Data	
Base Data	£000			
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A	
Savings/Invest	£000		Change in employees	
	Year 1	300	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	100	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3		Year 3	
	Year 4		Year 4	
	Year 5		Year 5	
	Total	400	Total	0

<p>Key benefits</p> <p>Total savings and Income generated has been estimated at £400K pa based on the demand levels noted above and an average price of £35 per collection.</p>
--

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Likely to lead to increase in tonnage through Reuse & Recycling centres. - Veolia will need to develop with the Council an IT online booking system. - A Communications plan will need to be developed.
--

<p>Procurement strategy</p> <p>N/A</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	300	100			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	300	100	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	300	400	400	400	400
Payback Period: n/a					

Charging for replacement wheelie bins

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Charging for replacement wheelie bins
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Free service becoming chargeable for new or replacement residual and recycling bins	May discourage recycling
	Increase in stolen bins
	Impact on resident satisfaction

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: Charging for new and replacement containers to residents for both recycling and residual bins.</p>
<p>Rationale: Based on the assumption that once the charge is introduced demand for containers will reduce by 50%, resulting in the number of requests for containers reducing from 8,000 to 4,000. The savings are made up of two components, the reduction in the current contractual sum (£100K) together with a profit of £11.00 per bin equating to an annual sum of £50K. It is assumed that both recycling and residual bins will be charged for.</p> <p>Creates a value to the bins – engender greater responsibility for looking after bins and responsible waste management. Some other local authorities charge for replacement containers – Enfield and Brent for example.</p> <p>The Outreach team would continue to vet requests to encourage recycling and correct use and allocation of containers.</p>

SUMMARY				
Base Data	Financial Data	Workforce Data		
	£000			
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A	
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees		
	Year 1	100	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	50	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3		Year 3	
	Year 4		Year 4	
	Year 5		Year 5	
	Total	150	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: Total Income generated has been estimated at £100K in the 1st year and £50k in the following year based on the demand levels noted above.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Continued outreach team to determine residents needs. Risk that if this policy is announced in advance it could lead to a demand on containers whilst still free. New IT / online payment system to be developed with Veolia.</p>

<p>Procurement strategy N/A</p>
--

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	100	50			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	100	50	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	100	150	150	150	150
Payback Period: n/a					

Charging for recycling bins and increasing residual bins for RSLs, Managing Agents, Developers etc...

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Charging for recycling bins and increasing residual bins for RSLs, Managing Agents, Developers etc...
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Free service to Managing agents/developers becoming chargeable for supply/replacement of Communal Recycling bins - possibility of costs being passed to residents	May discourage recycling Charging for recycling bin hire would make flats policy consistent with schools bin charges
	Could increase levels of stolen bins
	Could increase side waste

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: Extend charging of managing agents/developers for hire/replacement of communal recycling bins and review communal residual bin hire charge</p>
<p>Rationale: Currently managing agents of blocks of flats are charged £145/year (£2.80/week) for Communal Residual Waste bin hire but Communal Recycling bins are made available free of charge, at the council's expense for supply, repair/maintenance and replacement. Set Recycling Hire @ £145/year (£2.80/week); Additional Income = £100K Increase Residual hire charge by 20% to £3.40 per week = £20K additional income</p>

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
	Year 1	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3	Year 3	
	Year 4	Year 4	
	Year 5	Year 5	
	Total	Total	0
	50		
	50		
	100		

<p>Key benefits: Total Income generated has been estimated at £50K pa.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Income not guaranteed</p>

<p>Procurement strategy: N/A</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	50	50			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	50	50	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	50	100	100	100	100
Payback Period: n/a					

Reduce Education & Outreach Team

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Reduce Education & Outreach Team
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Stopping /Reducing service
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Potentially less engagement/ communications with residents on waste minimisation, recycling and waste collection issues	Reduced recycling
	Increased fly tipping
	Residents satisfaction levels reduced

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: Restructure entire Veolia Communications, Education & Outreach function and reduce Education/Outreach team by 50%.</p> <p>Rationale: Following changes in the Veolia contract with service level reductions and changes in legislation relating to recycling (i.e. TEEP) the need for Veolia to have all the tools to deliver performance targets has reduced. Therefore it is proposed to reduce the educational and outreach team and review how the remaining resources can be used more effectively by working more closely with Council's communication team.</p> <p>Key benefits: The proposed changes would deliver a savings of £115K pa.</p>

SUMMARY				
Base Data	Financial £000		Workforce	
Current budget	N/A		Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000		Change in employees	
	Year 1	50	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	65	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3		Year 3	
	Year 4		Year 4	
	Year 5		Year 5	
	Total	115	Total	0
<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Review and negotiation of contractual performance targets/ payment mechanism with Veolia. There will be a greater need for the outreach team to support the other income/service change proposals as set out in this document. Therefore savings split over two years.</p>				

<p>Procurement strategy:</p>
<p>Personnel Implications: Up to 4 Veolia staff members could be made redundant. The Council will be liable for redundancy payments.</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	50	65			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	50	65	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	50	115	115	115	115
Payback Period: n/a					

Close Park View Road R&R

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops
Reference:	Close Park View Road R&R
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Stopping /Reducing service
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Reduction of an R&R site	Reduction in resident satisfaction
	Potential increase in fly tipping

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To close the Park View Road Reuse and Recycling Centre</p>
<p>Rationale: Historically Haringey has had only one Reuse and Recycling Centre, which has been a small site on Park View Road (PVR), Tottenham. The borough now has a larger second site in the centre of the borough, which can cater for the waste which is currently deposited at PVR. The impact of the closure of PVR is assumed to be minimal as those who wish to responsibly dispose of their waste in a car will travel to an alternative site within the NLWA network, including the Western Road site. As part of its DCO application NLWA intend to add to the current network by building a new R&R site at Edmonton in 2020/21. The PVR site is earmarked for redevelopment as part of the wider regeneration proposals for residential housing/ new school on Ashley Road Depot. Relocating the site locally (Sedge Road) has been considered, however the cost of this site has been estimated at a £1m plus and would not deliver the £230K revenue savings. Also the site could be made redundant with the building of the new R&R site at Edmonton.</p>

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data £000	Employees	Workforce Data
Current budget	N/A		N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	115	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	115	Year 2	n/a
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	230	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: Revenue savings of £230K paid to NLWA through the levy payment.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Value of the regeneration site at Ashley Road has been calculated on the site being vacant, including the PVR R&R. The capital receipt for this site is helping to fund the proposed new depot site/ development at Marsh Lane.</p>

<p>Procurement strategy: Personnel Implications: London Waste Limited will need to relocate or make redundant up to 5 staff</p>
--

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	115	115			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	115	115	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	115	230	230	230	230
Payback Period: n/a					

Rationalisation of Visitors Permits and increase in hourly permit charge.

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Traffic Management
Reference:	Rationalisation of Visitors Permits and increase in hourly permit charge.
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Residents will have to pay more for VP	Less VPs issued
Residents aged between 60 and 75 will no longer be entitled to a concession	More journeys undertaken by walking, cycling or public transport

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: This involves a review of the Visitor Parking (VP) Permit scheme, rationalising provision of permits and bringing charges in line with other boroughs, see below.</p> <p>Proposals also involve reducing the concessionary entitlement, which currently offers a 50% reduction in charge to residents aged 60 years or over, and those registered disabled (this group is also allowed double the normal allocation of permits). In future it is proposed that this concession will be limited to those aged 75 years or over. No change is proposed to those residents registered as disabled.</p> <p>The proposals include a reduction in the range of different types of VP permits offered, reducing unnecessary overheads. This will involve removing the two hourly, weekend and two weekly Permits. It is proposed to increase the VP from 35p to 80p per hour.</p>
<p>Rationale: For a borough with Inner London parking pressures the cost of an hourly visitor permit is low, which in turn does not help to manage demand for parking space and encourage residents and visitors to walk, cycle or use public transport. Rationalisation of the number of permits will help the administration of the scheme and reduce overheads.</p>

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
	Year 1	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3	Year 3	
	Year 4	Year 4	
	Year 5	Year 5	
	Total	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: This would involve removing the current limit on the number of hourly permits that may be purchased, but increasing charges from 35p per hour to either; -60p per hour, which would generate in the region of an additional £250k annually or -80p per hour, which would generate in the region of an additional £300k annually Both estimates take account of a possible reduction in the numbers purchased The concession change would result in a saving of £50K.</p>
--

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Will require IT development and working closely with Customer Services</p>
--

Procurement strategy:

N/A

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	125	225			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	125	225	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	125	350	350	350	350
Payback Period: n/a					

Relocating Parking/CCTV Back office Processing & Appeals

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Traffic management
Reference:	Relocating Parking/CCTV Back office Processing & Appeals
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	New delivery model
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
None	None

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To relocate 1st stage parking appeals and CCTV enforcement processing outside London. A number of operating models will be considered. Final 2nd stage appeals will be retained by the Council.</p>
<p>Rationale: Services delivered outside of London attract reduced cost due to a number of factors which includes accommodation costs and staffing costs as well as benefits in being able to recruit more readily. The London Borough of Islington successfully operate an in house service provision in Manchester. We are also aware that the London Boroughs of Barnet, Enfield and Waltham Forest operate 1st stage appeals outside of London through a third party provider.</p>

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	13
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
	Year 1	Year 1	
	Year 2	Year 2	13
	Year 3	Year 3	
	Year 4	Year 4	
	Year 5	Year 5	
	Total	Total	13

<p>Key benefits: A reduction in operating costs of £380K</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IT systems will have to be developed and aligned between offices. - Finding suitable accommodation to relocate staff. - The potential recruitment of new staff.

<p>Procurement strategy A full procurement of the service would need to be undertaken, taking between 12 to 18 months</p>
<p>Personnel Implications: If agreed up to 13 staff would be relocated or transferred (TUPEd) to a new provider. Staff not willing to relocate will face compulsory redundancy.</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)		380			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	380	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	380	380	380	380
Payback Period: N/A					

Permits CO2 charging regime

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Sustainable Transport
Reference:	Permits CO2 charging regime
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Increased cost for those resident with higher CO2 emissions.	Residents select vehicles with lower CO2 emissions
	Improved air quality
	Reduced vehicles

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To review the existing CO2 charging regime and change the banding linked to the DVLA scheme. Also to remove the additional charge per vehicle per household.</p>
<p>Rationale: The council's transport policies aim to reduce the harmful emissions from transport and improve air quality. As a result the Council introduced a CO2 emissions based permit charging structure in 2008. It is proposed to review the existing charges and introduce the same CO2 banding as used by the DVLA.</p> <p>It also intended to remove the current incremental increase for additional cars per household as this has proved to be difficult to administrater.</p>

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data £000	Employees	Workforce Data
Current budget	N/A		N/A
Savings/Invest			
Year 1	£000	Change in employees	
	100	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	300	Year 2	n/a
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	400	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: To charge vehicles with higher CO2 emissions. It is expected the charging regime will increase revenue up to £400K.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: New charging for bands will require IT development/costs. Permit charge increase will be subject to statutory consultation.</p>

<p>Procurement strategy N/A</p>
--

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	100	300			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	100	300	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	100	400	400	400	400
Payback Period: n/a					

Shared Service Centre

Priority	X
Current Service Area	Shared Service Centre

Proposal:	
	6.3

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
No impact on residents	N/A

Current budget	9,025	Employees	336
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Total	3,250	Total	0

BENEFITS CASE

<p>Detailed description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Carry out a high-level options review (November 2016) ii. Carry out a detailed options appraisal including cost and benefit analysis (April 2017) iii. Members agree new Service Delivery Model (June 2017) iv. Complete Transition to New Service Delivery Model (April 2018) <p>Benchmark and industry standard savings for shared services have been used to establish likely savings.</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	0	250	1500	1500	
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	250	1500	1500	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	250	1750	3250	3250
Additional Cost Estimated					

COMMERCIAL CASE

Procurement strategy :

Procurement Strategy is dependant on the option chosen. Factors influencing timescale will include:

- The requirement to tender;
- Availability of appropriate existing Shared Service model;
- Need to bespoke standardised processes.

FINANCIAL CASE

Key benefits

Financial - delivery of proposed MTFS savings. The benefits shown have yet to be verified through a detached business case but are an indication of when the savings would be realised. Confirmation of exact costs, benefits and timescales will be known once a detailed business case is prepared

Non-financial - improved service delivery through partnership working with other organisations, including access to better IT systems and sharing of improved processes and procedures

Funding Position	Total	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
	(project life)					
Revenue funding from existing budget	0	TBC				
Revenue funding required – new	0					
Project Management costs	0					
Capital funding from existing budget	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capital funding required – new	0	0	0	0	0	0

MANAGEMENT CASE

Describe the delivery of the preferred option, including the approach to Project, project and change management, and the governance arrangements:

The preferred option for new delivery model for back-office services has yet to be determined as it is subject to an options review.

The Programme Management Office is currently leading a high-level options review. This will include alternative delivery models, risks, benefits, implementation costs and transition timescales.

Internal dependencies and external constraints:

Front-office services - significant potential synergies with front office services; needs of both services need to be considered as part of any future service delivery option

Personnel - significant impact on staff; could be subject to TUPE, and requirement to consult with Trade Unions and Staff

Alexandra House - Decant

Priority	X
Current Service Area	All

Proposal:	
	6.3

Impact on Residents		Outcomes	
No impact on residents		N/A	
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Total	1,000	Total	0

BENEFITS CASE

Detailed description:
The proposal is to vacate 5 floors of Alexandra House in 2017 and the remaining floors in the following twelve months. Realisation of savings will depend on renegotiation of rent as we vacate the building or our ability to sub-let those floors we do vacate. Hence, the cost/benefit model assumes savings appearing in 2018/19 and 2019/20.

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)		250	750		
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	250	750	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	250	1000	1000	1000
Additional Cost Estimated					

Closure of internal print room

Priority	X
Current Service Area	Communications

Proposal:
 To close the internal print service with a saving of £50.5K in the year 2018/19. The current bulk print service is only 65% utilised.

We will utilise our existing print framework to use suppliers which can continue to deliver a high volume and responsive service.

Resources required:
 N/A

What needs to happen and when?
 Work with Committee Services to reduce the demand for printed agendas, looking at IT solutions which allow councillors to mark up PDFs using their laptop or tablet. This development is already in the workplan of the new Shared Digital Service.

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
No impact on residents	N/A

Base Data	£000	Change in employees	
Savings/Invest	£000	Year 1	Year 1
Year 1			
Year 2	51	Year 2	1
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	51	Total	1