



DERBY CITY COUNCIL

**2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Income
Generation/Savings Proposal - IT Services - Application
and Contract Review (saving to offset Digital Strategy
pressure)**

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	3.694m		2.206		
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL					Net Budget
Total FTE's					
Total FTE	94				
DCC Funded (FTE)	94				
Externally Funded (FTE)	0				

Proposal

Description

Application & Contract Review (savings to offset Digital Strategy pressures)

The Council is currently undertaking an Application & Contract Review in line with the MTFP that involves standardising on best-of-breed, de-duplicating applications that do similar functions, cutting back on features so that we only pay for what we really need and

Classification: OFFICIAL

generally delivering cost savings and value for money to the Council.

These savings are being generated as part of the review to offset Digital Strategy pressures from 20/21 going forwards as a result of the delivery of the Digital Workforce and Digital by Default Work Programmes.

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget				
Saving (Future Networks)	0.056			
Saving (Staffing Efficiencies)	0.107			
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget	0.163			
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving	0.163			
FTE impact (cumulative)	2 to 3			

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities			
Customers			
Businesses			
Organisational Capacity	Reduction in staffing	Con	New ways of working

Classification: OFFICIAL

	Increase effectiveness and efficiency of the workforce	Pro	Change Derby functional leverage activity
Partners			

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box		✓	

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	The Application & Contract Review is a driver to deliver savings and efficiencies across Digital and Customer Management
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	Ensure all spend against the programme meets all Procurement and Commissioning Council guidelines
Lean and Effective	This programme will deliver staffing efficiencies across the Digital and Customer Management organisational structure
Spending and Income	These savings offset Digital Strategy pressures across Digital and Customer Management

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Lee Haynes

Classification: OFFICIAL

Date:	19/12/2019
Director:	Andy Brammall
Date:	19/12/2019
Head of Finance:	
Date:	

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Income Generation/Savings Proposal - Annual Leave Purchase (All Directorates)

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	121.568				
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL	121.568				Net Budget 121.568m
Total FTE's					
Total FTE	2839				
DCC Funded (FTE)	2839				
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

Description

All Derby City Council employees who have transferred onto the new terms and conditions are eligible to apply to purchase up to ten days additional annual leave per year, which is subject to manager approval. Approval is only given when business needs can continue to be met throughout the year without the need for additional resources.

For the last two financial years the total annual leave purchase across all directorates has been around £0.180m, this includes the reduction to national insurance as a result of reduced Gross Pay. The breakdown across directorates is detailed below:

Communities and Place - £0.044m

Classification: OFFICIAL

Corporate Resources - £0.055m
 Peoples – Adults - £0.031m
 Peoples – CYP - £0.050m

It is proposed to reduce employee budgets in each directorate in line with the additional annual leave purchase to match actual pay required. A level of prudence has been applied to the savings proposal due to the uncertainty of the level of take up of additional annual leave in future years.

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Total 2019/20 Employee Budget plus 2% inflation (All Directorates)	121.568			
Saving - Annual Leave Purchase Saving (All Directorates)	0.150			
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget	0.12%			
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)	0			
Net Saving	0.150			
FTE impact (cumulative)	0			

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities			
Customers			
Businesses			
Organisational Capacity	Reduction in working days as a result of additional annual leave.	Business needs will continue to be met and annual leave only approved by managers when sufficient cover is available within teams.	Approval only given when business needs can continue to be met without the need for additional resources.

Classification: OFFICIAL

Partners			
----------	--	--	--

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box			x

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	
Date:	
Director:	Simon Riley
Date:	
Head of Finance:	Toni Nash
Date:	

Classification: OFFICIAL

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Income Generation/Savings Proposal Staffing Efficiency – Corporate Health & Safety

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	0.295		0.032	0.033	
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL	0.295		0.032	0.033	Net Budget 0.294
Total FTE's					
Total FTE	8				
DCC Funded (FTE)	8				
Externally Funded (FTE)	0				

Proposal

Description [Insert Narrative]

Having secured approval for a new Corporate Health & Safety Policy Statement and set out a clear matrix of accountabilities and responsibilities for health and safety throughout the council the corporate team is developing all the related policies and guidance to improve assurance and efficiency. This together with the full development of the training programme will create efficiencies with CHST.

It is proposed to delete one of the vacant senior adviser roles.

Classification: OFFICIAL

--

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget	0.294	0.249	0.249	0.249
Saving				
Senior H&S Adviser role (grade J)	0.045			
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget	15%			
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving	0.045			
FTE impact (cumulative)	1			

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities	None		
Customers	None		
Businesses	None		
Organisational Capacity			
Partners	None		

Assessment of Deliverability

Classification: OFFICIAL

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box			✓

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Darren Allsobrook
Date:	
Director:	Dinesh Kotecha
Date:	
Head of Finance:	
Date:	

Classification: OFFICIAL

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



DERBY CITY COUNCIL

2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Income Generation/Savings

Proposal To bring trade union facility time into line with our comparator councils – proposed General Fund only saving.

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	0.129	0	0	0	
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL	0.129	0	0	0	Net Budget 0.129
Total FTE's					
Total FTE	6				
DCC Funded (FTE)	6				
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

Description:

To begin consultation with the Trade Unions, whose facility time is funded by the General Fund, on the amount of facility time and associated costs available for the financial year 2020/21, with a view to bringing facility time and arrangements in line with comparator councils.

--

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget				
Saving/Income [please detail]	£40k	0	0	0
Saving/Income [please detail]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Saving/Income [please detail]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget				
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Net Saving	£40k	0	0	0
FTE impact (cumulative)	0	0	0	0

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities	N/A		
Customers	N/A		
Businesses	N/A		
Organisational Capacity	N/A		
Partners	N/A		

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the	Green – Deliverable –
-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	-----------------------

Classification: OFFICIAL

	additional work	savings/income figures	savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box		X	

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	This proposal would support the theme of lean and effective by reviewing and potentially rationalising the facility time arrangements and costs.
Spending and Income	

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Liz Moore
Date:	25 September 2019
Director:	
Date:	
Head of Finance:	
Date:	

Classification: OFFICIAL

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Document Management Centre (DMC) Additional Income Generation (BS1)

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context DMC (1000111)	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	0.704		0.783	0.125	
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL	0.704		0.783	0.125	Net Budget £1.362
Total FTE's					
Total FTE	23.09				
DCC Funded (FTE)	23.09				
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

Description

The DMC has been successful in promoting its services externally to GP surgeries across the City. Following pilots, formal service level and information sharing agreements are now in place for two of the surgeries (Lister House & Hilton) and it is expected that others will follow. Balancing the priority of support to the Council and delivering external support to achieve real income is a challenge, so the proposal is to extend the service incrementally over a period of years. To minimise any increase in costs all external provision must be contained within the existing staff resource capacity. The DMC has a full cost recovery pricing model, so this support is not subsidised by the Council.

The DMC provides a full scanning and indexing service and has direct access to patient records. The colleagues within Business Support have received all the necessary training and are gaining the experience to deliver a first class, invaluable support service to assist the NHS.

Classification: OFFICIAL

Savings on this particular external income stream have already been approved and are included in the 2019/20 (£10k) and 20/21 (£30k) income targets for the DMC. This additional proposal reflects the expectation that support demand will continue to expand in future years.

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget (Income Target)	0.125	0.125	0.135	0.145
Additional external income	0.025	0.010	0.010	0.010
Total additional income as a % of current income target	20%	8%	7.4%	6.9%
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving	0.025	0.010	0.010	0.010
FTE impact (cumulative)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities			
Customers			
Businesses			
Organisational Capacity	Existing DMC staffing resource to deliver	Needs to be carefully managed but achievable	
Partners	NHS/GP Surgeries across the City	Improves partnership arrangements with NHS and potential for future collaboration	

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver/require	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the	Green – Deliverable – savings/income
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	---

Classification: OFFICIAL

	additional work	savings/income figures	achievable
Please tick the relevant box			√

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	Successful external service offer
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Amanda Verran
Date:	11/09/19
Director:	
Date:	
Head of Finance:	
Date:	

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Income targets in School Admission Appeals (Democracy service)

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	0.626	0	0.963*	0.02	
External Funded	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL	0.626	0	0.963	0.02	1.569
Total FTE's	19				
Total FTE	19				
DCC Funded (FTE)	19				
Externally Funded (FTE)	0				

*Includes Members' Allowances cost centre which totals £0.891m

Proposal

Increase income targets in School Admission Appeals – business within the sold service has steadily grown as more local schools have transferred to academy status. The service is currently expected to exceed its income target of £20k for 2019/20 – proposal to increase income target to £30k for 2020/21.

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget	1.569	-	-	-
School Admission Appeals Income	-0.01	-	-	-
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget	0.6	-	-	-
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)	-	-	-	-
Net Saving	0.01			
FTE impact (cumulative)	0			

Impact of Proposals

- As a greater number of schools convert to academy status, the School Appeals Business Manager has received a number of enquiries from schools seeking to instruct the council to clerk admission and exclusion appeals on their behalf.
- Risks – a high quality service is currently provided to existing customers. If the sold service continues to grow, there is a risk that the quality of service may diminish if business demand outstrips available resources
- Mitigation - currently exploring options to recruit a larger pool of lay and experienced panel members and in the event that the team reach capacity recruit an additional Appeals Officer.

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
School Appeals income			X

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	Income generation through sold services and the use of existing assets for commercial purposes.
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	As above.
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	As above.

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Alex Hough
Date:	12 September 2019
Director:	
Date:	
Head of Finance:	
Date:	

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Income Generation relating to disposal of small DCC land holdings

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	0.737	0	0.923	(1.130)	
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL	0.737	0	0.923	(1.130)	Net Budget 0.531
Total FTE's					
Total FTE	16.4				
DCC Funded (FTE)	16.4				
Externally Funded (FTE)	0				

Proposal

Description

Savings of £20k per annum were put forward previously for MTFP relating to financial years 19/20, 20/21 and 21/22.

This proposal has been updated and reflects an additional income of £10k per annum for the years, 20/21, 21/22.

Classification: OFFICIAL

--

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget	0.531	0.531		
Saving				
Saving/Income [please detail]	0.010	0.010		
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget				
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving				
FTE impact (cumulative)				

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities	None		
Customers	None		
Businesses	None		
Organisational Capacity			
Partners	None		

Classification: OFFICIAL

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box			✓

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	Disposal of small DCC land holdings should generate income to the Council to support the MTFP
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Jayne Sowerby-Warrington
Date:	30/09/19
Director:	Dinesh Kotecha
Date:	30/09/19
Head of Finance:	Toni Nash

Classification: OFFICIAL

Date:	
-------	--

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP –Savings Proposal – Foster Care Recruitment

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded Fostering placements		15.9			
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL		15.9			Net Budget
Total FTE's					
Total FTE					
DCC Funded (FTE)					
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

Description

The Council spends £15.9 million on providing fostering placements for its children in care. These placements are either provided internally by our own foster carers or from agencies where we do not have enough of our own carers to meet our corporate parental responsibilities.

On average an internal placement costs considerably less (£20,000) than one purchased from an agency and the Council has recently established a Corporate Fostering Board to oversee the corporate priority of recruiting more foster carers with a target an additional 35 households each year.

Classification: OFFICIAL

Current performance is promising, there are 27 potential foster carers booked into fostering panels within the next few months. It is therefore felt that it would be appropriate to review the MTFP savings targets in line with the current interest.

The Current MTFP already includes a target for the conversion of 20 placements from agency to in-house over the period 2020/21 2021/22 (£400,000 savings target).

It is proposed to increase the savings target by a further 20 carers in each of the financial years 2020/21 and 2021/22, £400,000 in total. This requires a continual review as the deliverability is dependent on a successful recruitment campaign.

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget				
Saving/Income [please detail]	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget				
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving	0.2	0.2	0.2	
FTE impact (cumulative)	0	0	0	

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities			
Customers	Children are placed closer to their communities and experienced high quality carers.		
Businesses			

Classification: OFFICIAL

Organisational Capacity			
Partners			

Assessment of Deliverability


Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box		✓	

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	Foster care recruitment is a corporate priority.
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Suanne Lim
Date:	23 September 2019
Director:	

Classification: OFFICIAL

Date:	
Head of Finance:	
Date:	23 September 2019

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Savings Proposal – Reconfiguration of the access and referrals into Children's Social Care

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded					
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL					Net Budget
Total FTE's					
Total FTE					
DCC Funded (FTE)					
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

A review of the arrangements for the referral into social care, partly as a result of the JTAI, is seeing some positive results in the demand for children's social care. Numbers of looked after children are plateauing around 560 and the numbers of children in need are at 1512 (31 August 2019), the lowest we have seen them for a number of years. The numbers of child protection plans are also stabilising and were 442 at end of August 2019 in comparison to 563 in March 2016.

This proposal is based on the assumption that the LAC population will reduce, particularly at the more complex, costly end of the spectrum as the new model for referral embeds and partner engagement is improved.

--

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget				
Saving	200	200	200	
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget				
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving	200	200	200	
FTE impact (cumulative)	0	0	0	

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities			
Customers	Reduction in the numbers of looked after children		
Businesses			
Organisational Capacity			
Partners			


Classification: OFFICIAL

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box		✓	

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	Reconfiguration of the 'front door' into children's social care is seeing a reduction in demand for services.
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Suanne Lim
Date:	23 September 2019
Director:	
Date:	
Head of Finance:	

Classification: OFFICIAL

Date:	23 September 2019
-------	-------------------

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Savings Proposal – Children's Early Help Management Restructure

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	5		0.4		
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL					Net Budget £5.4 m
Total FTE's	122				
Total FTE					
DCC Funded (FTE)	122				
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

Management Restructure

Early management structures with the Early Help Teams have resulted in the deletion of a Service Director post and two Heads of Service. This final element to the restructure is the proposal to delete 2 Team Manager posts.

--

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget	5.4			
Saving – deletion of 2 team manager posts	0.1			
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget	1.8%			
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving	0.1			
FTE impact (cumulative)	2			

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities			
Customers			
Businesses			
Organisational Capacity			
Partners			

Assessment of Deliverability


Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the	Green – Deliverable –
-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	-----------------------

Classification: OFFICIAL

	additional work	savings/income figures	savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box			✓

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	Review of management structures
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Suanne Lim
Date:	23 September 2019
Director:	
Date:	
Head of Finance:	
Date:	23 September 2019

Classification: OFFICIAL

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Savings (Proposal Land, Flood & Drainage Team)

Following the consultation process, and further investigation, an opportunity has been identified to fund these posts through a different route. It is proposed therefore that, whilst the posts will no longer be lost, the revenue saving can still be made. It is still the Council's intention to merge the Land Drainage and Flood Defence team with our Engineering team to ensure greater resilience for both teams going forward.

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	0.3		0.3	-0.3	
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL	0.3	0	0.3	-0.3	Net Budget
Total FTE's					
Total FTE	8				
DCC Funded (FTE)	8				
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

Reduction of 7 FTE to 4 FTE and relocate to 3 Engineering and 1 to Highways Asset Management.

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£113k			
Budget	£0.3m	£0.3m	£0.3m	£0.3m
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget	37.7%			
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving	113k			
FTE impact (cumulative)	3			

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities	Potential for incidents of flooding to increase	Pros: none Cons: Potential increase in flood risk	Relocating to Engineering Design will allow for work to be distributed amongst other technical staff Encourage greater resilience/self-support within communities Carry out full LEAN review of the service
Customers	Potential for incidents of flooding to increase	As above	As above

Classification: OFFICIAL

Businesses	Potential for incidents of flooding to increase	As above	As above
Organisational Capacity	Slower response to planning applications, designing schemes, potential reduction in the ability to attract grant funding	Pros: Delivers a saving Cons: Increased pressure on remaining staff and other teams	As above
Partners	As above		As above

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box			/

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	

Sign Off	
-----------------	--

Classification: OFFICIAL

Proposer/Author:	Dave Kinsey
Date:	11/09/19
Director:	Richard Antcliff
Date:	11/09/19
Head of Finance:	
Date:	

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Savings (Grounds Maintenance Officers)

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	2.2		0.7	-1.4	
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL	2.2	0	0.7	-1.4	Net Budget
Total FTE's					
Total FTE	81.6				
DCC Funded (FTE)	81.6				
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

Reduce Grounds Maintenance Officers (Supervisors) (4 FTE to 3 FTE)

Please indicate the total number of grounds staff, the various teams etc to give broader context.

The service is split into two teams:

- Streetpride Grounds
- Derby Homes

The Streetpride Grounds team consists of:

- 2.5 Grounds Maintenance Officers (GMO's)
- 5 x Chargehand Gardener
- 5 x Tractor Driver Gardener

Classification: OFFICIAL

- 27 x Gardener
- Derby Homes team consists of:
- 1 x GMO
 - 2x Chargehand Gardener
 - 11 x Gardener
- Golf Course:
- 0.5 GMO
 - 3 x Golf Staff

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£37k			
Budget	£1.5m			
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget	2.5%			
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving	37k			
FTE impact (cumulative)	1			

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities	None	Pros – none Cons – a reduction in quality of works may be noticed	Develop better ways of working including the use of technology Cross team working with Highways
Customers	None	As above	As above
Businesses	None	As above	As above

Classification: OFFICIAL

Organisational Capacity	Pressure increased on remaining Grounds Maintenance Officers particularly given the drive to reduce absence and tackle poor performance	Pros – delivers savings Cons – increasing pressure on remaining staff and potential reduction in quality of works	As above
Partners	None		

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box			/

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Dave Kinsey

Classification: OFFICIAL

Date:	11/09/19
Director:	Richard Antcliff
Date:	11/09/19
Head of Finance:	
Date:	

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Savings (Trading Standards)

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	0.60	N/A	0.04	(0.01)	
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL	0.60	0.00	0.04	(0.01)	Net Budget
Total FTE's	14				
Total FTE					
DCC Funded (FTE)	14				
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

Reduction in Trading Standards Fair Trading Officer or Trading Standards Officer (1 FTE)

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m

Classification: OFFICIAL

Budget	£0.6			
Saving [please detail]	£0.029(FTO)			
Fair Trading Officer (FTO) OR Trading Standards Officer (TSO)	£0.045(TSO)			
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget	FTO – 4.8% TSO – 7.5%			
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)	N/A			
Net Saving	£0.029 OR £0.045			
FTE impact (cumulative)	1			

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities	Trust and Confidence	Reduced visibility of service in the community and a lower profile.	Continue to use media / social media to raise profile of the service.
Customers (Consumers)	Public Health and Safety	Reduced capacity to respond to incoming complaints from the public.	Service currently prioritises 'vulnerable' victims and is mainly intelligence led.
Businesses	Support for legitimate business	Reduction in market surveillance and advice to businesses. Reduction in inspections / test purchasing. Statutory inspections under the Food Standards Agency's code of practice. Reduction in enforcement against non-compliant businesses.	Service currently prioritises high-risk inspection activity. Charging for Business Advice – for example through Primary Authority (limited scope). Make use of powers under the proceeds of crime Act following prosecution cases to bring in additional funds.

Classification: OFFICIAL

Organisational Capacity	Resilience	Loss of expertise and experience and the ability to carry out food standards and weights and measures work (TSO post).	Consider using apprentice levy (if available) to train staff requiring formal qualifications.
Partners	Trust and confidence	Reduction in capacity to work in partnership with other internal and external agencies. Reduction in regional trading standards work.	Priority given to safeguarding and Public Health related services.

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box			/

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	Using data (Nearest Neighbours) from the Chartered Institute of Public

Classification: OFFICIAL

	<p>Finance (CIPFA) indicates that the size of the trading standards team is currently in the top quartile for both budget and number of FTE's. Nationally the average number of staff working in the Trading Standards Service is 14.6 FTE's – reference - Chartered Trading Standards Institute Workforce Survey 2017.</p> <p>Note: Although, this data is useful it does need to be treated with some caution as not all services carry out the same functions. For example some authorities do not carry out Petroleum Licensing, Animal Health and Food Standards.</p>
--	--

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Doug Walkman
Date:	11/09/19
Director:	Richard Antcliff
Date:	11/09/19
Head of Finance:	
Date:	

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Savings (Assistant Compliance Officer) Highways

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	2.0		2.1	-1.8	
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL	2.0	0	2.1	-1.8	Net Budget
Total FTE's					
Total FTE	53				
DCC Funded (FTE)	53				
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

Delete Assistant Compliance Officer (1 FTE). Leaves Compliance Officer (1 FTE)

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£25k			

Classification: OFFICIAL

Budget	£2.3m			
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget	1.1%			
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving	25k			
FTE impact (cumulative)	1			

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities	None		
Customers	None		
Businesses	None		
Organisational Capacity	None	Pros – delivers saving Cons – none	Duties will be picked up by the admin/tech support team
Partners	None		

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box			/

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Classification: OFFICIAL

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Dave Kinsey
Date:	11/09/19
Director:	Richard Antcliff
Date:	11/09/19
Head of Finance:	
Date:	

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



DERBY CITY COUNCIL

**2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Income Generation/Savings
Proposal Planning, Transportation & Engineering Department
– Traffic & Transportation Service**

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Traffic & Transportation:

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	3.319		12.148	(12.106)	
External Funded (please specify)					
TOTAL	3.319		12.148	(12.106)	Net Budget 3.361
Total FTE's	88.1				
Total FTE					
DCC Funded (FTE)	88.1				
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

Description

The budget proposal sets out a package of both savings and income generation within the Traffic and Transportation service. The service contains a diverse range of functions that allow the Council to discharge its responsibilities as the Highway Authority.

This budget proposal is driven by the changing expectations of citizens in relation to transport, including online and mobile app provision and increasing our ability to target local issues. There is also a conscience step towards a more entrepreneurial approach, where this is appropriate. The service is seeking to create lean and efficient processes, particularly through the adoption and use of new technology. This is being led through the Parking Service, to which the majority of these proposals relate.

Traffic and Transport budgets include income that ranges from large external capital funding for major infrastructure projects, alongside enforcement required to manage our highway network. The budget also carries a large single cost for the national Concessionary Fares (Gold Card) scheme which is operated by Derbyshire County Council.

The 2020/23 proposal has elements of both saving and income generation:

- Savings: Removal of vacant post, ending of the subsidy for the 17A bus service and efficiencies in contracts
- Income: Efficiencies in the delivery of parking services through the introduction of new technology

Parking Services

Parking services have been through a full restructure in 2019/20 which is included in this year's savings targets. The budget proposals build on these changes and positive work with Chipside, the software provider, to realise the potential of the system. The introduction of online payment through MiPermit and Virtual Permits for residential areas increases the ability to target enforcement and flexibility to target offers and incentives. The increased utilisation of online forms and self-service by customers will not only reduce costs of paper and postage but also releases staff to allow them to focus and improve other functions such as debt recovery. A number of the activities are already in place but the figures give the potential full year effects for 2020/21.

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget				

Saving: Removal of vacant post (16 hours) and End subsidy for 17A bus service	0.0198			
Saving: Efficiency through new debt registration contract and improved debt recovery	0.0160			
Income: Efficiencies through the introduction of online tools including MiPermit App and Virtual	0.1095			

Classification: OFFICIAL

Permits for residential areas and targeted enforcement				
Income: Improving flexible response to local issues through the introduction of second camera car, targeted enforcement and improving signage	0.1020			
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget				
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving	0.2473			
FTE impact (cumulative)				

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities	<p>17A Bus: User numbers are currently low, however without subsidy route unlikely to continue.</p> <p>Parking: The Virtual Permit scheme should be easier to use for residents including securing visitor passes etc which they can self-manage.</p>	<p>17A bus: Very likely the service will end so a negative impact on current users.</p> <p>Parking: Should be positive overall including targeted enforcement which communities want.</p> <p>Initial introduction will need support particularly for those people without online access</p>	17A: No mitigation as the route is subsidised as bus providers do not consider it viable.
Customers	<p>17A Bus: User numbers are currently low, however without subsidy route unlikely to continue.</p> <p>Parking: The changes should means customers have more control over their parking – where they park and how they pay.</p>	<p>17A bus: Very likely the service will end so a negative impact on current users.</p> <p>Parking: The changes should increase customer service and create more opportunities to tailor services to customers.</p> <p>A strong engagement / comms plan needed to ensure those</p>	17A: No mitigation as the route is subsidised as bus providers do not consider it viable.

Classification: OFFICIAL

		customers without online access understand changes	
Businesses	Parking: Increased enforcement and targeted offers/support	Parking: Should provide positive opportunities to work more effectively with businesses	
Organisational Capacity	17A Bus: This is an anomaly as the only service subsidised by the Council. Parking: Increased efficiency will maximise the recent savings made through restructure	17A bus: Would allow a single status position for DCC Parking: Positive benefit overall and demonstrates good practice. Increased efficiency allows focus to be targeted in other areas such as debt collection. Also potential for apprenticeships	17A bus: N/A the service will end if we withdraw subsidy.
Partners	17A Bus: The withdrawal of our subsidy will require negotiation with the County Council who are less inclined to withdraw. If however we went ahead they are unlikely to cover the service and it would end. Parking: ICT Service provider for the new technology systems	17A bus: The County will be unlikely to remove the subsidy jointly with us. They are however, highly unlikely to continue to subsidise alone and this will end the service. Parking: Established relationship with ICT provider who have used Derby as trial area.	17A bus: N/A the service will end if we withdraw subsidy. On-going discussions with County, though there is no appetite for support. Parking: Continue to build pro-active relationship with provider to ensure continued innovation and goodwill

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
Please tick the relevant box	17A bus service subsidy ending	Parking income will ultimately be affected by levels of patronage linked to city centre offer particularly	Parking Contract efficiencies Introduction of parking technology & efficiencies Vacant post removal

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	Parking: proposals follow on from a full restructure in Parking Services.
Demand Management	Parking: the new data allows the team to better assess where demand is and where there are greatest pressures for parking as well as where there is greatest need for enforcement
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	Parking: the new electronic payment systems increases our ability to reduce debt and to target enforcement. New initiatives such as night enforcement should extend the potential.
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	Parking: New technology and the restructure has streamlined the processes used by the team, allowing them to target work and be more customer focused.
Channel Shift and Digital	Parking: Increased use of online forms and self-service.
Commercialisation	Parking: e-parking payment services is increasing commercial potential including targeted offers to individuals and getting new customers through events such as Pride recently
Procurement and Commissioning	Parking: Positive relationship with provider, who were recently awarded the Queens Award for Industry, where they mentioned the work done with Derby parking services team.
Lean and Effective	Parking: Processes increased use of technology to allow self-service
Spending and Income	Parking: Benefits in reductions in postage and paper work for other areas of the Council

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Nigel Brien, Head of Traffic and Transport
Date:	
Director:	Verna Bayliss, Acting Director of Planning, Transport & Engineering

Classification: OFFICIAL

Date:	
Head of Finance:	Amanda Fletcher
Date:	

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form



DERBY CITY COUNCIL

2020/21 to 2022/23 MTFP – Income Generation/Savings Proposal: Strategic Housing - income generation

Context

Members have requested background information to the service to provide context to the proposal. *This should be at service or cost centre level (whichever is the most relevant)*

Service Budget Context	Employees	Third Party Provision	Other Costs	Income	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	
DCC Funded	0.856	0	1.526	(1.526)	
External Funded (please specify)	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL	0.856	0	1.526	(1.526)	Net Budget
Total FTE's					
Total FTE	44				
DCC Funded (FTE)	44				
Externally Funded (FTE)					

Proposal

Description [Insert Narrative]

Increase income to Strategic Housing by £40k pa by adjusting the level of HRA income and fees re the DFG programme. This would therefore facilitate a £40k reduction in the GF support for this service. There are no service or FTE implications.

--

Specific Proposal only	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget				
Saving/Income [please detail]	40			
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Saving/Income [please detail]				
Total Saving/Income as a % of Budget				
Investment to deliver savings (e.g. invest to save)				
Net Saving				
FTE impact (cumulative)	0			

Impact of Proposals

Relating to Proposal only	Description	Assessment (Pros/Cons)	What mitigations are or can be put in place to minimise impact?
Communities	none		
Customers	none		
Businesses	none		
Organisational Capacity	none		
Partners	none		

Assessment of Deliverability

Assessment of Deliverability?	Red – Hard to Deliver requires additional work	Amber – Degree of Confidence within the savings/income figures	Green – Deliverable – savings/income achievable
-------------------------------	--	--	---

Classification: OFFICIAL

Please tick the relevant box			<i>Tick!</i>
------------------------------	--	--	--------------

Contribution to Corporate Themes

Relating to Proposal only	How does this proposal contribute towards delivery of Corporate Themes?
Organisational Structures	
Demand Management	
Income Generation/Fees and Charges	
Bureaucracy and inefficiency	
Channel Shift and Digital	
Commercialisation	
Procurement and Commissioning	
Lean and Effective	
Spending and Income	Income

Sign Off	
Proposer/Author:	Ian Fullagar
Date:	5/9/19
Director:	Greg Jennings
Date:	5/9/19
Head of Finance:	
Date:	

Please provide to your Head of Finance relevant working paper of how the saving/income proposal has been calculated and the evidence base supporting this. This should be submitted at the same time as submitting the form

