

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/AHWB/01**

3. Actions required to achieve saving:

Rough implementation timetable. Indicate in a sentence the stage of development you would anticipate for the proposal at six monthly intervals.

- Prices for service to be communicated and agreed with PCT.
- Invoices to be drawn up, sent and paid.

As at March 2010	Services communicated and agreed with NHS Tower Hamlets. Quarterly Invoice process agreed.
As at September 2010	Quarterly invoicing process implemented
As at March 2011	Regular invoicing
As at September 2011	Regular invoicing
As at 1 st April 2012	Regular invoicing

Anticipated date for full implementation:

1st April 2010/11

Implementation Risks/ Issues including management/ mitigation issues

This saving proposal will need to be sensitively negotiated with NHS Tower Hamlets in the context of their Medium Term Financial Planning.

4. Potential implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets and other Directorates:

It is a legitimate responsibility for NHSTH to meet these costs. It will be necessary to establish a system for recharging these costs.

5. Other risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved following implementation

None

6. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured?

This option would increase income and therefore reduce the net cost to the Council.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

TITLE OF SAVING OPTION: Concessionary Fares

DIRECTORATE: CLC

SERVICE AREA: Environmental Control **LEAD OFFICER:** Bryan Jones

FINANCIAL INFORMATION:

	Current Budget	Saving £000s	
	2009/10 £000	2010/11	2011/12
General Fund	3,790	620	0
HRA			
Other			
Implementation Cost (see below)			
TOTAL	3,790	620	0

1. Outline/ details of saving proposal, including indications of stage of development, and work and timescales needed to finalise proposal:

Utilise savings of approximately £600k within the Concessionary Fares Budget resulting from an over estimate of costs by London Councils of the Freedom Pass Travel Scheme in 2009/10. The cost to the Council for providing Freedom passes which allow older and eligible disabled people who live in the borough to travel free on London's public transport network is £3.79m in 2009/10. The original estimated cost for this year was £4.39m based on information supplied by London Councils. This increase was as a result of a one off rebate of £27m due to over estimates of both non London Councils freedom pass travel and other bus operators.

As a consequence London Councils have recalculated costs for both this and future years which based on current projections would enable ongoing revenue savings with increased costs being met from the Parking Control Account.

2. Service implications of saving:

None.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

3. Actions required to achieve saving:

Rough implementation timetable. Indicate in a sentence the stage of development you would anticipate for the proposal at six monthly intervals.

As at March 2010	Fully Developed
As at September 2010	
As at March 2011	
As at September 2011	
As at 1 st April 2012	

Anticipated date for full implementation:

April 2010

Implementation Risks/ Issues including management/ mitigation issues

This proposal would result in £620k Revenue Saving for concessionary fares being utilised to offset other Directorate Budget pressures, with future projected increases in concessionary fares costs being met from the Parking Control Account.

Current cost projections for concessionary fares which are based on London Councils information indicate cost increases for LBTH of £1.1m in 2010/11, with further increases of £600k in 2011/12 and £300k in 2012/13. It is proposed that these additional costs are met from the Parking Control Account.

The risks to this proposal are as follows:

1. London Councils projections are based on a five year funding deal, which will require the Government continuing to provide Concessionary Fares Special grant of £50m (allocated for introduction of the national travel concession).

Recent communication from the Department for Transport suggests that the Government are considering changing the distribution mechanism for this special grant (which will necessitate consultation). If the formula for distribution was changed it is estimated that costs to LBTH would increase by a further £1m in 2010/11. (i.e. £2.1m increase on 2009/10 level)

2. Whilst current Parking Control Account projections indicate that the necessary level of funding would be available to meet the additional cost of concessionary fares as calculated by London Councils, there is no guarantee that the necessary level of fee income can be maintained through to 2012/13.

4. Potential implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets and other Directorates:

None

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CLC/01**

5. Other risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved following implementation

Change of methodology from Central Government in allocating Financial Support for Concessionary Fares Scheme.

6. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured?

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CLC/02**

TITLE OF SAVING OPTION: Directorate General Efficiency Savings

DIRECTORATE: CLC

SERVICE AREA: ALL **LEAD OFFICER:** Service Heads

FINANCIAL INFORMATION:

	Current Budget	Saving £000s	
	2009/10 £000	2010/11	2011/12
General Fund	20,600	64	264
HRA			
Other			
Implementation Cost (see below)			
TOTAL	20,600	64	264

1. Outline/ details of saving proposal, including indications of stage of development, and work and timescales needed to finalise proposal:

This proposal would result in general efficiencies being identified across the Directorate, specifically within running cost budgets (e.g. materials, equipment) and via the formal introduction of a staff turnover factor, all of which would be managed via Service Heads and the Directorate Management Team.

The current arrangement for managing running cost budgets is vested with individual Budget holders this proposal would push the responsibility to service heads who would oversee the process via their management teams. Turnover within the Directorate is based around the concept of ensuring necessary financial and staffing resources are available at all times to meet Directorate targets and priorities. This proposal would ensure that targets and priorities would continue to be achieved, but would enable formal consideration of timescales for staff turnover to be managed and monitored resulting in modest savings within salary budgets.

2. Service implications of saving:

None, process would be managed to ensure no detrimental impacts on service provision.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

3. Actions required to achieve saving:

Rough implementation timetable. Indicate in a sentence the stage of development you would anticipate for the proposal at six monthly intervals.

As at March 2010	
As at September 2010	
As at March 2011	
As at September 2011	
As at 1 st April 2012	

Anticipated date for full implementation:

April 2010 and 2011

Implementation Risks/ Issues including management/ mitigation issues

Potential for all staff turnover to occur in priority areas.

4. Potential implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets and other Directorates:

Increased timescales for recruiting to non priority vacancies.

5. Other risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved following implementation

6. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured?

Improved efficiency via increased productivity.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/DR/01**

TITLE OF SAVING OPTION: Requisition to Pay

DIRECTORATE: Development & Renewal

SERVICE AREA: Resources

LEAD OFFICER: Chris Holme

FINANCIAL INFORMATION:

	Current Budget	Saving £000s	
	2009/10 £000	2010/11	2011/12
General Fund	29	29	29
HRA			
Other			
Implementation Cost (see below)			
TOTAL	29	29	29

1. Outline/ details of saving proposal, including indications of stage of development, and work and timescales needed to finalise proposal:

The Corporate Requisition to Pay project being directed by the Head of Procurement and Corporate Programmes was initiated on the 14th May 2009, following approval from the Transformation Board.

The project will streamline and automate a number of resource intensive processes that are in place for the ordering of goods and services and their subsequent payment. The Requisition to Pay process will remove the need for manual authorisation and coding of invoices from Directorates. It will reduce the need for local systems and processes to be undertaken and maintained e.g. the scanning and logging of invoices.

The Directorate currently has a centralised arrangement for its purchasing and payments processing/approval function which is part of the Directorate Finance Team and this is provided by two technical support officers. The impact of the Requisition to Pay project shall have a direct impact on these two posts and it is expected that only one post in the future shall be required to provide this service.

2. Service implications of saving:

There are no service implications as a result of this saving.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

3. Actions required to achieve saving:

Rough implementation timetable. Indicate in a sentence the stage of development you would anticipate for the proposal at six monthly intervals.

As at March 2010	Terminate employment of temporary member of agency staff.
As at September 2010	n/a
As at March 2011	n/a
As at September 2011	n/a
As at 1 st April 2012	n/a

Anticipated date for full implementation:

1st April 2010

Implementation Risks/ Issues including management/ mitigation issues

The only risk of implementation is if there is a delay in delivery of the project.

4. Potential implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets and other Directorates:

The saving will reduce the authority's use of temporary and agency staff but will involve the release from temporary employment of an agency member of staff.

5. Other risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved following implementation

None

6. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured?

The Requisition to Pay project is due to deliver a series of benefits to the organisation and through better management information, provide better value for money. The full success and benefits of the project shall be reported Corporately by the Head of Procurement and Corporate Programmes.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/DR/02**

TITLE OF SAVING OPTION: Specific Site Redevelopment Planning

DIRECTORATE: Development & Renewal

SERVICE AREA: Major Project Development **LEAD OFFICER:** Owen Whalley

FINANCIAL INFORMATION:

	Current Budget	Saving £000s	
	2009/10 £000	2010/11	2011/12
General Fund	103	53	53
HRA			
Other			
Implementation Cost (see below)			
TOTAL	103	53	53

1. Outline/ details of saving proposal, including indications of stage of development, and work and timescales needed to finalise proposal:

Since 2006 Major Project Development have commissioned or provided speciality site and property redevelopment advice on major schemes from the planning, regeneration and viability perspective.

The budget has been used heavily over the last three years due to a number of major redevelopment schemes taking place in the Borough. Option appraisal and planning support in 2008/2009 included Blackwall Reach, Heron Quay, Poplar Baths, Ailsa Street, Bishop Challenor and others.

With current market and economic conditions, demand for the service is falling and therefore it is proposed that an element of the budget is offered as a recurrent saving.

2. Service implications of saving:

If market and economic conditions improve dramatically in future years, then this could have an impact on the demand for the service with the authority potentially having to incur costs to commission consultants.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/DR/02**

3. Actions required to achieve saving:

Rough implementation timetable. Indicate in a sentence the stage of development you would anticipate for the proposal at six monthly intervals.

As at March 2010	Reduce budget
As at September 2010	n/a
As at March 2011	n/a
As at September 2011	n/a
As at 1 st April 2012	n/a

Anticipated date for full implementation:

April 2010

Implementation Risks/ Issues including management/ mitigation issues

There are no initial risks associated with the implementation of this saving proposal. Future risks are detailed in section 5.

4. Potential implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets and other Directorates:

This is very specialised work which on the whole is provided externally. There are no identified implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets or other Directorates as a result of this saving

5. Other risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved following implementation

If market and economic conditions improve dramatically in future years, then this could have an impact on the demand for the service and therefore could cost the authority considerably to commission consultants as necessary as for example in 2008/2009.

6. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured?

The demand on the service has decreased and therefore the funding available is being reduced to reflect this. It is being considered whether it would be of use and beneficial to procure a call off contract to be used in order to achieve economies of scale in this area for future schemes.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CE/05**

2. Service implications of saving:

As a co-financing budget, the Corporate Match provides funding for initiatives that have secured alternative European, national and sub-regional finance. These funding regimes, on the whole support a proportion of the costs of a project, and organisations are required, as conditional funding, to secure that match. However, funds available from these funding regimes have reduced over recent years, meaning that there should be less demand on the Corporate Match Funding budget.

The process for allocating resources is on-going, however, there is a mixture of on-going and new initiatives that will come forward for co-financing support, and these resources are not yet committed. Unlike the Mainstream Grants process resources are not committed for 3 years.

The service implications will be minor, as there is no commitment to ongoing finance for any specific organisation, and include a reduction in the number of key local area agreement and regeneration strategy outputs and outcomes, which focus on improving employment, and economic development and enterprise.

As a co-financing provision the reduction in CMF as a co-finance support to other national and sub-regional funding regimes will be limited as major inward investment is being cut by central government. Furthermore the budget will still be £100k more than 2003/4. Whilst Single Regeneration programmes, and the European Structural Funds programmes (2000-07) have come to an end, many third sector organisations that are reliant on time-limited external grant funding will find it difficult to sustain their operations, and will have to seek alternative, more formal commissioning opportunities.

3. Actions required to achieve saving:

Rough implementation timetable. Indicate in a sentence the stage of development you would anticipate for the proposal at six monthly intervals.

As at March 2010	Organisations will be advised of the reduced resources available as part of the determination and commissioning process for continuation and new funding arrangements through the annual CMF process.
As at September 2010	
As at March 2011	
As at September 2011	
As at 1 st April 2012	

Anticipated date for full implementation:

1 April 2010

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CE/05**

Implementation Risks/ Issues including management/ mitigation issues

The Council has already agreed to this saving as part of the 2007/8 budget process, and the budget will be automatically reduced (and resources available to fund new activities) accordingly. Risk issues are primarily reputation for the Council, and sustainability for third sector organisations.

Given the reductions in traditional public funding programmes for local 3rd sector organisations (including European Structural Funds, Single Regeneration Budget, New Deal for Communities and Neighbourhood Renewal Fund) there is may be additional calls for mainstream funding – but this should be channelled through the Mainstream Grants process.

4. Potential implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets and other Directorates:

Whilst there will be no direct implications for Council staff arising from this proposal, the proposal could have a significant impact on local third sector providers, and must be seen in light of significant reductions in the traditional sources of external funding.

5. Other risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved following implementation

None – included in section 3 (above).

6. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured?

The proposal will, in effect, be a reduction in service. Officers will attempt to ensure, through effective appraisal and monitoring arrangements, that recommendations for CMF support are targeted at those activities that deliver the most effective, and value for money outputs and outcomes.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CE/01**

TITLE OF SAVING OPTION: CE's Service Improvement Efficiency

DIRECTORATE: Chief Executive's

SERVICE AREA: Chief Executive's

LEAD OFFICER: Louise Russell

FINANCIAL INFORMATION:

	Current Budget	Saving £000s	
	2009/10 £000	2010/11	2011/12
General Fund	TBC	38.5	38.5
HRA			
Other			
Implementation Cost (see below)			
TOTAL	TBC	38.5	38.5

1. **Outline/ details of saving proposal**, including indications of stage of development, and work and timescales needed to finalise proposal:

This saving will be found through more efficient deployment of service improvement resources, and in particular:

- Growing and further deploying more in-house service improvement approaches, such as improvement peer reviews and internal business transformation expertise;
- Sharing with partners to enable peer challenge and cross-partner approaches to service improvement;
- Reducing the amount of corporate service improvement support required as management and leadership development activity enables service managers to own and deliver this themselves.
- developing team expertise in Excelsis performance management system to minimise amount spent on external support;
- reducing publication costs by maximising web publication of Strategic Plan and Annual Report and reducing hard copies
- reviewing training and conference attendance to ensure necessary and contributes appropriately to team and personal development.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CE/01**

2. Service implications of saving:

This will be managed so as not to impact on the extent or quality of service improvement delivered overall.

3. Actions required to achieve saving:

Rough implementation timetable. Indicate in a sentence the stage of development you would anticipate for the proposal at six monthly intervals.

As at March 2010	Ongoing throughout period
As at September 2010	
As at March 2011	
As at September 2011	
As at 1 st April 2012	

Anticipated date for full implementation:

April 2010 onwards

Implementation Risks/ Issues including management/ mitigation issues

Unable to sufficiently build in-house capacity to take up this activity – this will be a key focus for the Strategy and Performance service, Organisational Development and the Transformation Board.

Unforeseen Excelsis support costs – we will work closely with ICT and the system suppliers to minimise and foresee any issues.

Demand for paper copies of web-based publications – we will undertake to provide printed versions on request.

4. Potential implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets and other Directorates:

See above.

5. Other risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved following implementation

See above

6. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured?

The Council will continue to deliver and accelerate service improvement within the reduced budget. This will be tracked and monitored through regular performance management arrangements and the Performance Review Group.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CE/02**

TITLE OF SAVING OPTION: C52 Legal Services

DIRECTORATE: Chief Executives

SERVICE AREA: Legal Services

LEAD OFFICER: I Freeman

FINANCIAL INFORMATION:

	Current Budget	Saving £000s	
	2009/10 £000	2011/12	2011/12
General Fund	3,898	14	14
HRA			
Other			
Implementation Cost (see below)	Nil		
TOTAL		14	14

1. Outline/ details of saving proposal, including indications of stage of development, and work and timescales needed to finalise proposal:

This is a £14,000 service efficiency savings from maximizing value for money on supplies & services.

2. Service implications of saving:

Efficiency Savings from Legal Services budget

3. Actions required to achieve saving:

The trainee solicitor post is vacant following the departure of the previous post holder. There is a paralegal post on fixed term that will not be renewed.

As at March 2010	Implemented by 31 March 2010 recruitment to start 1Jan 2010
As at September 2010	
As at March 2011	
As at September 2011	
As at 1 st April 2012	

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CE/02**

Anticipated date for full implementation:

1 April 2010

Implementation Risks/ Issues including management/ mitigation issues

None

4. Potential implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets and other Directorates:

If the posts were not to be replaced this will have an impact on the service output of Legal Services for the client departments which without proper planning with departments could lead to pressures on their priority outputs. Much of our work is reactive to client's urgent needs.

5. Other risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved following implementation

None

6. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured?

This is an efficiency saving as it will be funded

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CE/03**

TITLE OF SAVING OPTION: Reduce Pulling Together print run

DIRECTORATE: Chief Executive's

SERVICE AREA: Communications

LEAD OFFICER: Alex Louis

FINANCIAL INFORMATION: 2010/11 SAVINGS

	Current Budget	Saving £000s	
	2009/10 £000	2010/11	2011/12
General Fund	3,316	13	13
HRA			
Other			
Implementation Cost (see below)			
TOTAL	3,316	13	13

1. Outline/ details of saving proposal, including indications of stage of development, and work and timescales needed to finalise proposal:

Reduce the print run of Pulling Together, currently 5,000, to the low hundreds, which would be digitally printed to further reduce costs.

Pulling Together would then be distributed in an on-line version available on the intranet site, as do many councils for their staff communications.

Digital print copies would be available for staff without access to a computer, and managers can also download and print copies for staff with out computer access.

2. Service implications of saving:

None as digital and download and print copies available for staff without access to a computer.

This reduces the council's overall print expenditure as well carbon footprint and recycling.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CE/03**

3. Actions required to achieve saving:

Rough implementation timetable. Indicate in a sentence the stage of development you would anticipate for the proposal at six monthly intervals.

As at March 2010	Last printed copy of Pulling Together
As at September 2010	Savings in progress
As at March 2011	N/A
As at September 2011	N/A
As at 1 st April 2012	N/A

Anticipated date for full implementation:

April 1st 2010

Implementation Risks/ Issues including management/ mitigation issues

All staff emails alerts directing staff to on-line Pulling Together do not work.

4. Potential implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets and other Directorates:

Staff do not access on-line version of Pulling Together, same risk as staff not reading current hard copy version.

The limited number of hard copy versions do not reach staff without access to a computer.

5. Other risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved following implementation

6. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured?

Pulling Together will be distributed electronically saving staff time for manual distribution as well as saving on external printing costs.

Reduces lead in time for electronic version, which can also be updated or corrected quickly and at minima cost.

Pulling Together could become inter-active to enable greater staff involvement, engagement and feedback.

Not printing Pulling Together contributes to reduces the council's carbon footprint

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CE/04**

TITLE OF SAVING OPTION: Challenge Fund

DIRECTORATE: Chief Executive's

SERVICE AREA: Scrutiny and Equalities **LEAD OFFICER:** Michael Keating

FINANCIAL INFORMATION:

	Current Budget	Saving £000s	
	2009/10 £000	2010/11	2011/12
General Fund	255k	32.5	32.5
HRA			
Other			
Implementation Cost (see below)			
TOTAL	255k	32.5	32.5

1. Outline/ details of saving proposal, including indications of stage of development, and work and timescales needed to finalise proposal:

The Challenge Fund is used to support third sector organisations and community groups in delivering activities focused on One Tower Hamlets (tackling poverty and inequality, strengthening cohesion and building community leadership). A major feature of the Fund has been the development of innovative projects that help us tackle new and emerging issues, e.g. work for new communities. It has a significant impact on strengthening the capacity of communities across the borough and is a key feature of illustrating how we deliver the One Tower Hamlets theme of the Community Plan.

This Fund is available throughout the year and therefore the savings proposal could be implemented immediately.

2. Service implications of saving:

The reduction in the Fund would limit the ability of the Service to support activities in the community. Staff in the service would therefore need to review the management of the external expectations of the service.

This reduction would limit our capacity to respond flexibly to new central government initiatives as well as emerging trends from the community.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAV/CE/04**

3. Actions required to achieve saving:

Rough implementation timetable. Indicate in a sentence the stage of development you would anticipate for the proposal at six monthly intervals.

As at March 2010	Full implementation
As at September 2010	
As at March 2011	
As at September 2011	
As at 1 st April 2012	

Anticipated date for full implementation:

1st April 2010

Implementation Risks/ Issues including management/ mitigation issues

Managing expectations of the third sector and the community will be vital to achieving this reduction successfully and not creating pressure on other parts of the Council or partners to meet the shortfall.

4. Potential implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets and other Directorates:

As outlined above a reduced Fund limits our ability to respond creatively. In the longer term this may prevent the full development of new ways of working.

5. Other risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved following implementation

As above

6. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured?

The challenge will be to ensure that the Service continues to undertake work with the wider community that meets the Partnership's and Council's objectives. Progress will be monitored via the Service Plan and the annual Diversity and Equality Action Plan.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAVRES/01**

TITLE OF SAVING OPTION: Directorate wide Continuous Improvement Initiatives

DIRECTORATE: Resources

SERVICE AREA: All

LEAD OFFICER: All

FINANCIAL INFORMATION:

	Current Budget	Saving £000s	
	2009/10 £000	2010/11	2011/12
General Fund	15,904	143	143
HRA			
Other			
Implementation Cost (see below)			
TOTAL	15,904	143	143

1. Outline/ details of saving proposal, including indications of stage of development, and work and timescales needed to finalise proposal:

The Resources Directorate has an ongoing programme of continuous improvement in the services it provides and the way it provides them. VFM exercises and Cost Analysis have been undertaken in a number of services and these have identified savings in 2010-11 through improvement and best practice. It is anticipated that efficiencies of £143k will be achieved in 2010-11.

Service improvements will be measured through increases in relevant performance indicators and benchmarking information, e.g. the additional resources that would have been required in the past to achieve the improved level of output/service.

2. Service implications of saving:

R52 Admin Buildings 28000 - Delete 2 Posts LP07 55K + SO1 35K Total £90,000. The remainder will be met by ongoing programme of continuous improvement and efficiencies.

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAVRES/01**

3. Actions required to achieve saving:

Active participation in improving services and productivity through benchmarking, process re-engineering, streamlined processes.

Resource requirement for implementation (if any)	Nature of costs including whether revenue or capital	Cost of implementation £000s	Of which, from within existing resources £000s
In 2009/10	nil	nil	nil
In 2010/11	nil	nil	nil

Provide further detail on nature and any costs of implementation

No significant risks are envisaged.

Rough implementation timetable. Indicate in a sentence the stage of development you would anticipate for the proposal at six monthly intervals.

As at March 2010	
As at September 2010	£72,500
As at March 2011	£72,500
As at September 2011	
As at 1 st April 2012	

Anticipated date for full implementation:

March 2011.

Implementation Risks/ Issues including management/ mitigation issues

No significant risks are envisaged.

Payback calculation (where applicable):

N/a

4. Potential implications for staff, contractors, partners, assets and other Directorates:

N/a

**SAVING PROPOSALS
BUDGET 2010/11**

**Item Ref. No:
SAVRES/01**

5.	Other risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved following implementation
N/a	
6.	Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured?
Improved processes will reduce the overall costs of the service whilst the same level of information/service will be available.	