

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** CONSULTANCY SUPPORT

**DIRECTORATE:** EDUCATION

**SERVICE AREA:** STANDARDS & SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT      **LEAD OFFICER:** JANE CONNOLLY

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	362	51	51	51
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>

**1. Details of saving option:**

Freezing vacant post: The establishment for the secondary Ethnic Minority Achievement consultancy team is two full time equivalent posts. One is presently vacant. We would propose not to advertise the second post and to cover this work internally through deployment of other staff.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

Nil, as the Local Authority will be able to maintain the current level of service with the integration of EMA work within the School Development Advisor role, in line with the single conversation.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

One post held open

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Freeze post

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>		
None			
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>		
None			
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>		
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>		
Integration of some of the work of the EMA team into the work of other Education staff.			

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:**       SCHOOLS CAUSING CONCERN

**DIRECTORATE:**       EDUCATION

**SERVICE AREA:**       STANDARDS AND SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT       **LEAD OFFICER:**       DI WARNE

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	100	61	61	61
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>61</b>

**1. Details of saving option:**

In 2003-04 the Education Directorate submitted a successful growth bid for schools causing concern. £100,000 growth was approved for the LEA Budget (not schools) as part of school improvement. The number of schools in special measures/serious weaknesses has significantly decreased from 28 schools in 2000/01 to only three (1 SM, 2 SW) and the Directorate has targets of nil.

We can now reduce this budget by £61,000 to reflect the reduction in SCC. The money is used primarily to support school action plans - fewer schools, fewer action plans - and most goes on external consultants.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

It is vital we meet our target of no further schools being categorised as a School Causing Concern by Ofsted.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

Less flexibility for supporting SCC

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Reduction in intervention budget.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>		
None			
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>		
One or more school being categorised as a SCC by Ofsted.			
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>		
Is this?	Gershon Cashable efficiency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Non-Gershon Saving
<input type="checkbox"/>			
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>		

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** INCLUSION ADVISOR

**DIRECTORATE:** EDUCATION

**SERVICE AREA:** ACCESS & INCLUSION      **LEAD OFFICER:** HELEN JENNER

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	61	61	61	61
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>61</b>

**1. Details of saving option:**

Delete the post of Inclusion Advisor in the Access and Inclusion Team

**2. Service implications of saving:**

This has been a key post in achieving the Inclusive Education Strategy. However service improvements have been made in key outcome areas for this post:

- improved attainment
- a reduction in statements
- an improvement in the number of schools achieving very good or excellent Inclusion judgements from OFSTED
- value for money figures that demonstrate inclusive approaches to support children experiencing special educational needs
- improved attainment.

School Development Advisers could be supported by other Access and Inclusion Teams to ensure inclusive practices continue to develop in schools. This is supported by improved data analysis to help address attainment gaps for any vulnerable groups of children.

There is a risk that the focus on developing inclusive practices in schools lead by the Inclusion Adviser working with SDAs may be diluted.

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/ED/03</b>
------------------------------------

<b>3. Staffing implications of saving:</b>					
	The previous post holder left in January 2005. The post has not been filled since then. Staff previously managed by the Adviser could be line managed in other Access and Inclusion or School Improvement Teams.				
<b>4. Action required to achieve saving:</b>					
	Reduce Access and Inclusion budget. Re-allocate line managed staff to other Education/Children's Services Teams. Inform schools of change and additional SDA emphasis on inclusion.				
<b>5. Possible effect on other directorates:</b>					
	None				
<b>6. Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>					
	None. If inclusion outcomes indicators were seen to falter remedial action would need to be taken.				
<b>7. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>					
	The Access and Inclusion Services will maintain progress on inclusion outcomes indicators whilst spending less money.				
<b>Is this?</b>	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 40%;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 40%;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>8. Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** ADMIN SUPPORT RATIONALISATION

**DIRECTORATE:** EDUCATION

**SERVICE AREA:** STRATEGIC & OPERATIONAL SERVICES      **LEAD OFFICER:** ISOBEL CATTERMOLE

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	556	61	61	61
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>61</b>

**1. Details of saving option:**

A rationalisation of posts across the Local Authority in order to produce a generic administrative support team. This would be achieved by the termination of existing temporary staff contracts from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

Individual service areas would not have dedicated staff to organise and service their admin requirements.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

2 FTE posts deleted across the service.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Restructure of admin support, the LEA would identify a number of posts for deletion.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>		
None			
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>		
Restructure of teams to have a generic team of admin support staff.			
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>		
Outputs of service delivery would be unaffected – a reduction of staffing costs, more effective methods of work allocations, better standards in the quality of admin support.			
Is this?	Gershon Cashable efficiency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Non-Gershon Saving
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"></div> </div>			
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>		



**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/ED/06**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** HUMAN RESOURCES

**DIRECTORATE:** EDUCATION

**SERVICE AREA:** STRATEGIC & OPERATIONAL SERVICES      **LEAD OFFICER:** ISOBEL CATTERMOLE

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	52	26	26	26
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>26</b>

**1. Details of saving option:**

The Teachers Pay Reform Grant (from 2006-07) will become part of the Dedicated School Grant and distributed through the schools funding formula. Consequently, a 0.5FTE saving on the current full time admin HR position will materialise through distribution of funding to schools in a more efficient way.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

Funding for the administration of the Threshold Payments is to be found through this grant.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

Nil

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Re-funding of administration post for Threshold Payments to be found from Threshold Grant.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:  
**SAV/ED/06**

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>				
N/A					
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>				
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>				
<p>The proposal would produce cashable efficiencies by streamlining the current processes for the distribution of this funding by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) reducing the requirement to process documented submissions from schools; and</li> <li>2) reducing the payment to schools from 3 points during the year to one annual payment.</li> </ol>					
Is this?	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding-right: 20px;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 30px; vertical-align: middle;">✓</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding-right: 20px;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 30px; vertical-align: middle;"></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	✓	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	
<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	✓	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>			
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/ED/06**

<b>TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:</b> CAPPING INFLATION				
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b> EDUCATION				
<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> LEA BUDGET		<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b> ISOBEL CATTERMOLE		
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION:</b>				
	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>Saving</b>		
	<b>2005/2006 £000</b>	<b>2006/2007 £000</b>	<b>2007/2008 £000</b>	<b>2008/2009 £000</b>
	649	148	148	148
	<b>General Fund</b>			
	<b>HRA</b>			
<b>Other</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>649</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Details of saving option:</b>			
<p>Cap LEA budget inflation increases at 2.1% from 2.7% fully funded inflation growth of £649k, as agreed by Cabinet on 03/08/2005.</p> <p>Strategy 2006-07: staffing budgets protected and reduction in running costs (£148k represents 4% of total LEA supplies and services budget -  <b>e-communication</b>  Electronic publication – 20% reduction in printing costs  Electronic communication – 20% reduction in postage costs  Electronic training (savings in productive time and materials) – 8% savings</p>				
<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>			
<p>Service managers would have to look for efficiency savings each year to maintain service standards. Those managers who are solely funded through Standards Fund have been doing this for the last 3 years. Managers would need to focus on statutory functions being centrally provided, and could consider SLAs for non-statutory and advice functions.  Salaries will continue to increase year on year, and managers will be required to efficiently manage running costs to remain within budget.</p>				
<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>			
<p>Over time there will be staffing implications, service areas will eventually need to lose staff because of a reduced budget, the impact of this would depend on staff salary negotiations each year.</p>				

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/ED/06**

<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>			
All service managers informed that budgets will not increase in line with inflation this year (and any future years).				
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>			
Less free advice available for other directorates, may need to reduce attendance at development meetings etc.				
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>			
Risk is minimised by salary inflation being secured by the increase in the Local Government settlement.				
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>			
The proposal would produce cashable efficiencies, we would effectively be reducing prices for the same outputs across the service. (Cashable savings) Service areas would still be expected to demonstrate that outputs are either in, or improving towards the top quartile for London, but that they have contained inflation costs to 2.2%.				
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>			
Education Services are expected to show year on year improvements which demonstrate non-cashable efficiencies.				

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Redirect Government Grant for National Training Strategy and HRD Grant

**DIRECTORATE:** Social Services

**SERVICE AREA:** Strategic Services

**LEAD OFFICER:** Sally Holland

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund				
HRA				
Other	994	571	571	571
<b>TOTAL</b>	994	571	571	571

**1. Details of saving option:**

The Government has allocated grants to local authorities to meet the costs of new national minimum standards for training and human resource development requirements. Based on our current excellent performance in supporting the social care workforce and recruiting and developing staff through positive action schemes, we estimate that our maximum expenditure to meet DOH requirements will not exceed 423K and 571K of the available grant can therefore be redirected to fund required savings elsewhere.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

No direct implications. The excess grant will however no longer be available to fund new human resource development or training initiatives.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

None.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Readjustments to 2006/07 budget.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**5. Possible effect on other directorates:**

**6. Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved**

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

Is this?      **Gershon Cashable  
efficiency**

**Non-Gershon  
Saving**

**8. Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item**

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Communications Manager Post

**DIRECTORATE:** Social Services

**SERVICE AREA:** Policy & Planning

**LEAD OFFICER:** Sally Holland

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	71	45	45	45
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	71	45	45	45

**1. Details of saving option:**

Corporate communications have undertaken a restructuring and created individual Directorate communication posts. Whilst these posts are part of the Corporate structure they will be responsible for managing the Directorate communications and will be expected to work from within both the Directorate and Corporate bases. As the new posts carry a management responsibility it is proposed to delete the current communications manager post within Social Services.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

The new post within the Corporate Communications should ensure that there is consistency in the communications function across the Council and an improved service delivery.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

1 member of staff will be made redundant

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Consultation with staff affected in Strategic Services and agreement to implementation of new proposals

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**5. Possible effect on other directorates:**

None

**6. Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved**

None

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

Avoid duplication of work and greater consistency in communications function across the Council

Is this?      **Gershon Cashable  
efficiency**

**Non-Gershon  
Saving**

**8. Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item**



**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Delete Post of Resource Manager

**DIRECTORATE:** Social Services

**SERVICE AREA:** Adult Resources

**LEAD OFFICER:** Christine Oates

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	126	44	44	44
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	126	44	44	44

**1. Details of saving option:**

This option proposes that the post of Resource Manager is deleted.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

The Resource Manager post supports the Service Manager (Resources) and has line management responsibility for older people's day centres and the sheltered accommodation warden service. One of the day centres, Sonali Gardens, has now transferred to the management of St Hildas Community Centre, and the sheltered accommodation warden service has transferred, under the Housing Choice programme, to Bethnal Green and Victoria Park Housing Association. The post will then retain responsibility for the management of three day centres. This will transfer to the direct management of the Service Manager Resources.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

Displacement of current postholder. It is anticipated that redeployment will be achieved.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>				
Action in line with the Council's 'Handling Organisational Change' procedures.					
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>				
None anticipated.					
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>				
Failure to achieve redeployment could result in redundancy costs which would need to be offset against the saving.					
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>				
Reduction in management costs, whilst still providing the same volume and quality of service.					
Is this?	<table border="0"> <tr> <td><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				
None					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Commissioning Budget (Section 23)

**DIRECTORATE:** Social Services

**SERVICE AREA:** Children's Services

**LEAD OFFICER:** Dave Hill

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	11,500	422	422	422
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	11,500	422	422	422

**1. Details of saving option:**

**Make savings across the whole Section 23 Commissioning Budget**

Considerable work has been done to prepare the authority to be able to spend less on placements while retaining high quality services to a growing number of children. What follow are unit cost efficiencies and the further developments of alternatives to children becoming looked after.

The reasons for this include

1. Developing more kinship and extended family options
2. Recruiting higher numbers of in house foster carers
3. More adoptions
4. Better preventative work and outreach support to older children and families coming from the reorganisation of the residential service
5. Provide a better use of in house residential placements
6. More use of alternative orders (some are new orders) to prevent children becoming looked after

**Are these real savings, can they really be achieved?**

Unit costs are have been reducing over the last four years.

For all children looked after including children on respite breaks the weekly cost was

£724 in 2004-5

£736 in 2003-4

£777 in 2002-3

£825 in 2001-2

Current number of children looked after 395 CLA (426 with respite break children) full year effect £265,000

**Why would further savings be achievable in 2005-6?**

This year in house unit costs have been high in residential while a review and the subsequent reorganisation has been carried out. This will be complete by April 2006.

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/SS/04</b>
------------------------------------

We are increasing the numbers of adopters and in house foster carers we are recruiting. The number of residence orders continues to rise. Last year there were 14. This year there are 10 already with a further 15 pending. (Children on Residence Orders are not looked after although they do attract allowances)

A reduction of 4 placements provided by independent fostering agencies (IFAs) would realise a further £100,000.

A reduction of in the use 1 placement provided by external residential will realise £100,000

These reductions do mean having 4 less placements in IFAs and 1 less in residential for all 52 weeks of the year or the net equivalent. However taken with an increase in prevention, active efforts to shorten some periods of being looked after and further increases in the use of residence orders (allied to the introduction of Special Guardianship) a further saving of £157,000 is realistic.

<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>
-----------	--

The aim is to maintain the quality of service currently delivered. Further developments in our in house options in fostering and adoption and also residential will need to be carried through. As well as continuing to work to appropriately lower unit costs there will also be developments in alternatives to and prevention of care. These will include slowing down entry of children into care, and improving timescales for planning at the point of entry into care to shorten the time that some children spend in care. There will be further developments in kinship care, intensive support to families, and further increases in the use of residence orders rather than children becoming looked after.

<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>
-----------	---

None

<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>
-----------	---

An action plan will need to be devised and actively monitored and regulated to ensure that there is no drift in meeting this targeted saving.

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>
-----------	---

None

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**6. Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved**

A larger than budgeted for increase in the children looked after population would adversely effect the above proposals. There are demographic pressures already noted above. On occasion changes in this population can be also be caused by policy shifts in government thinking and requirements.

Another risk factor would be a sudden increase in the number of children on secure orders. The unit cost of these placements is very high.

Should the business case for Fostering and Adoption Teams to remain in Woodstock terrace fail this would have a detrimental effect on the authority's ability to recruit and in particular retain carers.

**7. 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 whole of this proposal for savings in the face of increasing numbers of children in the looked after population is based on efficiencies.

These include: -

- Improved commissioning including joint commissioning
- Recruiting more Tower Hamlets foster carers and adopters (who have lower unit costs)
- Better use of in house residential
- Increased use of alternative orders where appropriate
- Developing kinship care to allow children to be looked after in their own extended families
- Better prevention
- Better more responsive family support

**Is this? Gershon Cashable efficiency**

**Yes**

**Non-Gershon Saving**

**8. Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item**

The decrease in unit costs year on year since 2001-2 has created a considerable non cashable Gershon efficiency.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Admin post savings PMQA/CSMT

**DIRECTORATE:** Social Services

**SERVICE AREA:** Children's Services

**LEAD OFFICER:** Dave Hill

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	95	95	95	95
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	95	95	95	95

**1. Details of saving option:**

Delete 2 Administration Systems Managers (ASM) posts £70,000  
Delete 1 Administration post Scale 4 £25K

The administration system in Children's Services is now well established. Following the admin review the ASM posts were important in getting the new system up and running. They had a role to play across the whole service. There were initially 6 of these posts. 4 of these posts have either mutated into other posts or been redesignated and adapted to other roles. This leaves two posts to cover the whole service. Whilst the need for admin posts and support is always high these two posts are less important than they once were.

The Scale 4 post is offered as an efficiency saving following the reorganising admin support for a range of managers. Although there are always uses for the extra admin time and that extra capacity will be missed it is not a priority when compared to front line posts.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

The Administration Systems Managers have been involved in a range of projects. Both will be involved in enabling the service's move to Mulberry Place. One is heavily involved in the implementation of the Customer Promise. One has been involved in admin centralisation at Gladstone Place and also setting up an archiving section. They have other departmental responsibilities too such as the Communications Group.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

The three post holders would be subject to the Councils redeployment and redundancy procedure, in the normal way including involvement of the Trade Union.

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/SS/05</b>
------------------------------------

<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>
-----------	---

Redeploy two remaining Administration Systems Managers into other admin posts within the whole council

Redeploy Scale 4 post within the council

Action needs to be initiated to ensure redeployment into other posts by April 1<sup>st</sup> 2006 to ensure the full year saving is made

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>
-----------	---

None

<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>
-----------	---

The ASM posts are graded at a level that is unusually high for admin posts and this may make redeployment to a similar level elsewhere across the council difficult.

<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>
-----------	---

Other staff will absorb the work currently being completed by these staff.

Is this?      **Gershon Cashable  
efficiency**

Yes

**Non-Gershon  
Saving**

<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>
-----------	--

None

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:  
**SAV/SS/06**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Increase charge for mobile meals

**DIRECTORATE:** Social Services

**SERVICE AREA:** Older People's  
Commissioning

**LEAD OFFICER:** David Cowell

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	588	37	37	37
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37</b>

**1. Details of saving option:**

Increase charge for mobile meals from £2 to £2.20. Even with last year's increase of 20p the Tower Hamlets charge of £2.00 is the lowest within the Inner London Authorities group. Current average charge for 2005/6, excluding Tower Hamlets from the calculation, is £2.48.

The current charges (2005/6) within Inner London Authorities are as follows:

Camden	£2.30
City of London	£2.60
Greenwich	£3.20 (hot) £3.10 (frozen)
Hackney	£2.65
Hammersmith & Fulham	£2.20
Islington	£2.30
Kensington & Chelsea	£2.80
Lambeth	£2.10
Lewisham	£2.63
Southwark	£2.10
Wandsworth	£3.00 (hot) £2.35 (frozen)
Westminster	£2.25

It is likely that most of these prices will rise w.e.f. 01.04.06.



**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:  
**SAV/SS/06**

<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>		
An increase of 20p per meal will be unpopular with some service users and may be argued to cause difficulties for some.			
<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>		
None			
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>		
Early decision to enable consultation and necessary administrative arrangements to be put in place to collect new charge from 01.04.06.			
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>		
Education, who are the main providers of the meals, will need to collect the new charge. Last years increase charge had no significant impact on demand.			
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>		
No specific risk factors identified.			
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>		
The subsidy provided by the Council towards the true cost of the meal would be reduced. The charge paid by the service user would rise from 38% of the cost of a standard meal to 42% of the cost.			
Is this?	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>		
None			

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/SS/07**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Learning & Development

**DIRECTORATE:** Social Services

**SERVICE AREA:** Learning & Development

**LEAD OFFICER:** Sally Holland/Linda Crawford

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	839	157	157	157
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	839	157	157	157

**1. Details of saving option:**

It is proposed to make a saving of £157k from the Learning & Development budget, which will be achieved by making cuts in the following training budgets

1. End all external training that does not related to statutory duties and responsibilities
  2. Limit management development training by suspending CMS and DMS programmes
  3. Suspend non statutory children's training
  4. Reduce PQ Child Care Award to one cohort per year
  5. Reduce the frequency of some health and safety training courses
  6. Reduce the PQ One award cohort to one per year
  7. Suspend non statutory adults training courses
  8. Reduce number of places offered on Practice teaching programme
  9. Reduce the numbers of progression assessment workshops for social workers
  10. Suspend non statutory mental health training courses
  11. Cut number of assessor training programmes in the NVQ Assessment Centre by one cohort per year
- This proposal needs to be considered in conjunction with the Positive Action Scheme savings.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

The introduction of GSCC registration and national occupational standards for various staff groups within social work/care has meant that the Directorate must provide continuing professional development opportunities for most staff groups, but especially post qualifying training opportunities for registered social work staff. It is a requirement of the Care Standards Act that a minimum of 50% of domiciliary staff hold NVQ level 2 in Care. The Directorate has an obligation to ensure that it develops the social care workforce, including staff in local third sector agencies who provide social care services to our users. The Learning and Development strategy includes actions to meet government, Skills for Care and Tower Hamlets Council objectives for staff development and for the Investors In People Award.

The above proposals allow the existing training programme to continue in a reduced form. Teams would have to prioritise their external training and there would be a reduced in house training programme comprising of only statutory training courses run on a once yearly basis. Much of the learning and development issues identified for staff by their managers, through their PDRs, will need to be re-visited and perhaps spread out over a longer period of time.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/SS/07**

<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>							
<p>Current levels of funding have maximised government grants to ensure that all staff groups benefit from training as has been recognised in achieving our IIP status and in the beacon status for supporting the social care workforce. This proposal will mean that training will need to be re-prioritised and it may well be that some elements are deferred into coming years.</p> <p>The proposal will also impact on our ability to support the workforce through the complex changes currently facing social services particularly with the move into Children's and Adult Social Care services. Training requirements set by the DOH, Climbie enquiry and through Skills for Care will also be effected. The in house training programme will be significantly cut which will impact s on the third sector and however there will be a greater emphasis on training leading to qualification for all grades of staff. Activities such as team away days and attendance of external training will be affected.</p>								
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>							
<p>Social work teams to meet the cost of team building and away day activities.</p>								
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>							
<p> </p>								
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>							
<p>This proposal assumes a high level of stability in staff turn over and that existing staff have largely undertaken courses within the existing in house programme. Therefore risk factors include an increase in staff vacancies and the impact of recruiting new staff who require training in Tower Hamlets policies and procedures. The existing training programme takes into consideration current national priorities for training in relation to NVQ and post qualification training. This proposal reduces the council's ability to respond to changing and new requirements. For example the numbers of managers required to hold a management qualification or social work staff to hold the full Post Qualifying Social Work (PQSW) Award.</p> <p>Inability to ensure effective human resources management and a need to ensure that reforms in service provision can be achieved.</p>								
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>							
<p>Efficiency and value for money will continue to be measured by the quality of service provided, staff retention and compliance with government and council objectives.</p> <p>There are elements of Gershon cashable efficiencies, and non Gershon savings in the detail of this savings option, outlined at Section 1.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;"><b>Is this?</b></td> <td style="width: 30%;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 30%;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>				<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>							
<p> </p>								

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/SS/08**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Professional Training Scheme

**DIRECTORATE:** Social Services

**SERVICE AREA:** Learning & Development

**LEAD OFFICER:** Sally Holland/Linda Crawford

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	875	243	345	350
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	875	243	345	350

**1. Details of saving option:**

There are a number of professional training schemes in Social Services which form a key part of the council's strategy for achieving a workforce to reflect the community. Currently there are 54 trainees undertaking social work and occupational therapy training through these schemes. These trainees will be returning to take up qualified positions over the next 5 years. The scheme also contributes to the directorate's recruitment and retention campaign and has had a significant effect on reducing social work and OT vacancies.

The DOH now expects all local authorities to operate trainee social work schemes and has provided funding for this through the National Training Strategy Grant.

One of these schemes is the Positive Action Scheme which comprises a number of training and employment schemes leading to a qualification. Schemes include: Direct access for graduates, an entry level scheme offering work experience prior to qualifying training and a scheme for school/college leavers. It has been normal practice to refill training places as staff qualify.

It is proposed to a) cap replacement funding for locum cover to operational teams at £23,000 b) not to recruit to any of the schemes until 2008.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

The Directorate has an obligation to ensure that it develops the social care workforce, builds capacity within the community, and has strategies in place to meet the Council objective of workforce to reflect the community. By implementing this saving there will be no immediate impact on this obligation, however, capacity to respond to emerging social care needs and the subsequent need to grow new types of social care workers will be reduced. For example social workers for Bangladeshi families with hearing impaired children and Vietnamese and Chinese social workers.

Operational teams will feel the impact of this saving. The cap on replacements funding at 23k will effect the quality and level of replacement staff they can provide.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/SS/08**

<b>3. Staffing implications of saving:</b>					
	<p>There will be a review of the different routes to qualification offered through the scheme in 2006/7 to ensure that it meets new service needs in a cost effective way. Currently there are 8 entry level posts in Adults and Children's divisions that are used as the gateway to social worker training. It is envisaged that from 2007/8 only 4 posts in each division will be used as the gateway to social worker trainee posts. <i>Note: The 4 remaining posts in both Children's and Adults would remain as Family Support Workers/AROs as these posts are funded from within the Divisions..</i></p> <p><i>We have also agreed a range of additional social work training as a one - off which increases staff on qualifying training by a further 22 posts. These staff will qualify over the next 5 years.</i></p>				
<b>4. Action required to achieve saving:</b>					
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree capping of replacement funding</li> <li>2. Agree to halt recruitment to the scheme until 2008/9</li> <li>3. Review the qualification routes during 2006/7 and ensure that training strategy meets the needs of the authority.</li> </ol>				
<b>5. Possible effect on other directorates:</b>					
	<p>The schemes will continue to operate for the coming five years while current trainees complete their training. It is not envisaged that there will be an impact on other directorates.</p>				
<b>6. Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>					
	<p>A high vacancy rate occurring in Social Services (in relation to the establishment of the children's or adult care service) or occupational therapy over the coming 2-3 years may mean that we need to revisit the scheme and restart recruitment at an earlier date than 2008/9.</p>				
<b>7. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>					
	<p>This action provides an opportunity to review the scheme and consolidate previous work. The numbers going through the schemes are unprecedented and the scheme is a huge success. It will be important to reassure the community that there has not been a change in policy rather that there is a need for the council to ensure that we can offer a quality service to the large number of trainees going through the system. Efficiency will continue to be measured by the numbers of trainees successfully completing the scheme, users' feedback and service outcomes.</p>				
	<p><b>Is this?</b></p>	<p><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>8. Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:  
**SAV/SS/09**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Mayfield House Closure

**DIRECTORATE:** Social Services

**SERVICE AREA:** Adult Resources

**LEAD OFFICER:** Christine Oates

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
<b>General Fund</b>	1,552	200	200	200
<b>HRA</b>				
<b>Other</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>	1,552	200	200	200

**1. Details of saving option:**

This option proposes that the Mayfield House Day Centre for Somali Elders is closed, and alternative provision made for existing service users.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

Mayfield House is a 30 place day service, operating from Monday to Friday. It was established some years ago, when the previous Granby Day Centre became a lunch club for Somali elders. It was intended to provide for older people in the Somali community whose level of need was greater than could be met through lunch club provision. However, occupancy has always been low. An average of 14 people attend a day, and it is not currently clear that they all have a level of need which requires a full day care service. There are a total of 25 service users on the register.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

The existing staff team would be displaced - 1 manager, 4 day care officers, and 1 cook. Within the Council's 'Handling Organisational Change' procedures, redeployment opportunities would be sought for these staff.

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/SS/09</b>
------------------------------------

<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>				
<p>Care reviews will be undertaken with all service users, to identify the most appropriate alternative provision. In relation to displaced staff, consultation and action will be required in line with the Council's 'Handling Organisational Change' procedures.</p>					
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>				
<p>Transport for the centre is provided by Transport Services in the Environment and Culture Directorate. The transport recharge costs (£37k) have been netted off the projected saving, on the basis of an assumption that they will be redistributed across other cost centres.</p>					
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>				
<p>Achieving successful redeployment for all staff could be difficult. However, any potential R&amp;R costs to revenue budgets, which would need to be offset against the saving, are likely to be minimal. It may be difficult to identify appropriate alternative provision for all service users. The saving cited assumes that new costs of £40k will be incurred in commissioning replacement services for some service users.</p>					
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>				
<p>This service is running at 47% occupancy. By ceasing the provision, and re-providing for service users within existing service capacity, resource utilisation will be maximised. The efficiency improvement will be measured via the budgetary effect: the volume of service provided will be maintained within a reduced budget.</p>					
<b>Is this?</b>	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				
None					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

<b>TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:</b>		Reduction in BT rental costs for CCTV lines		
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>		Environment & Culture		
<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>		Street Management	<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	John Palmer
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION:</b>				
	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>Saving</b>		
	<b>2005/2006</b>	<b>2006/2007</b>	<b>2007/2008</b>	<b>2008/2009</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
<b>General Fund</b>	264	80	100	100
<b>HRA</b>				
<b>Other</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>	264	80	100	100
<b>1.</b>	<b>Details of saving option:</b>			
	As a result of replacing leased BT lines saving the Council's CCTV network with a fibre network in conjunction with the development of a new CCTV Control Room for the Borough, the current costs expended on the BT lines will be saved.			
<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>			
	None			
<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>			
	None			
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>			
	The current leased line network will need to be replaced by a fibre network. The funding for the CCTV Control Centre and the fibre network is being provided by NRF with a £250,000 Council contribution.			



<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/EC/01</b>
------------------------------------

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>				
None					
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could present this saving being achieved:</b>				
Delay in replacing the leased lines with a fibre network. Tender returns higher than budget.					
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency / value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency / better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured</b>				
This saving is generated from a large project relating to the relocation of the CCTV Control Centre to the Borough. Having a CCTV Control Room within the Borough under our own direct control will be both more efficient and effective than the current arrangements.					
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** York Hall –change of energy provision from steam to gas boilers

**DIRECTORATE:** Environment and Culture

**SERVICE AREA:** Recreation **LEAD OFFICER:** Paul Martindill

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	1,486	10	10	10
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	1,486	10	10	10

**1. Details of saving option:**

Capital investment provided jointly by LBTH and Greenwich Leisure Ltd will fund the removal of the existing steam boilers at York Hall and replace these with a modern gas heating system. This is projected to provide a significant saving on the costs of heating the building.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

The service will remain operational while the transfer of energy systems is undertaken. The steam system will continue to operate until the gas system is in place and functioning. When this has been achieved the steam system will be removed. This approach ensures service continuity.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

There is no staffing implication for this project.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Completion of works currently on site.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**5. Possible effect on other directorates:**

None

**6. Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved**

Gas prices rise significantly above inflation

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

Greater efficiency will be achieved by reduced heating expenditure on a large public building. New gas heating systems provide more efficient heat delivery and less energy waste

**Is this? Gershon Cashable efficiency**

Yes

**Non Gershon Saving**

**8. Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item**

None

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Neighbourhood Wardens – Integration with Safer Neighbourhood and Local Environment Teams

**DIRECTORATE:** Environment & Culture

**SERVICE AREA:** Environmental Control                      **LEAD OFFICER:** David Saunders

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	206	206	206	206
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	206	206	206	206

**1. Details of saving option:**

The Safer Neighbourhoods initiative began in three wards in 2004 and was rolled out in each ward across the borough by July 2005. Local Environment Teams (LETS) were established in August 2005 This saving results from the integration of the Neighbourhood Wardens function into the LETs and SNT teams following the end of the part ODPM funded pilot project.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

Every SNT consists of a minimum of six uniformed officers - one sergeant, two constables and three police community support officers (PCSOs). They work to priorities set by local people through the Local Area Partnerships (LAP) Steering Groups, comprised of Tower Hamlets residents. Priorities are set on the basis of consultation with the community and analysis of police and partnership data. The Safer Neighbourhood Teams have taken over the warden's public reassurance and intelligence gathering role while the environmental aspects of the Warden's role is now fulfilled by the Local Environment Teams who work closely with the SNTs

**Staffing implications of saving:**

None. All staff have either been redeployed or found alternative employment

**Action required to achieve saving:**

The saving has already been achieved

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

Item Ref. No: <b>SAV/EC/03</b>
-----------------------------------

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>				
None					
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>				
None					
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>				
<p>Close working between the LETs and SNT ensures a co-ordinated response to local peoples' concerns across a wide range of safety and environmental issues.</p>					
Is this?	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 40px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 40px;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

<b>TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:</b>		Accommodation Strategy – reduction of planned maintenance provision		
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>		Environment & Culture		
<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>		Propety & Facilities Management	<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	Graeme Peacock
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION:</b>				
	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>Saving</b>		
	<b>2005/2006 £000</b>	<b>2006/2007 £000</b>	<b>2007/2008 £000</b>	<b>2008/2009 £000</b>
<b>General Fund</b>	280	200	280	280
<b>HRA</b>				
<b>Other</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>	280	200	280	280
<b>1.</b>	<b>Details of saving option:</b>			
	With the implementation of the Office Accommodation Strategy the planned maintenance programme for buildings that will be vacated over the next two years can be wound down and a saving realised.			
<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>			
	None			
<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>			
	None			
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>			
	Concentration of planned maintenance expenditure into buildings to be retained.			
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>			
	None			

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

Item Ref. No: <b>SAV/EC/04</b>
-----------------------------------

<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could present this saving being achieved:</b>				
None					
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency / value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency / better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured</b>				
The Council's Office Accommodation Strategy is designed to be more efficient and to deliver best value for money by reducing the number of properties occupied and by occupying properties which are more fit for purpose and hence less expensive to run.					
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				
None					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

<b>TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:</b>		Accommodation Strategy – Staffing /Lease Cost Reductions		
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>		Environment & Culture		
<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>		Property & Facilities Management	<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	Graeme Peacock
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION:</b>				
	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>Saving</b>		
	<b>2005/2006</b>	<b>2006/2007</b>	<b>2007/2008</b>	<b>2008/2009</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
<b>General Fund</b>	14,968	151	677	1,027
<b>HRA</b>				
<b>Other</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>	14,968	151	677	1,027
<b>1.</b>	<b>Details of saving option:</b>			
	<p>With the implementation of the Office Accommodation Strategy the Council will be closing existing buildings from April 2006 with others to follow in 2007/2008 and 2008/2009. It is anticipated that the LEB Building and 723 Commercial Road will be completely closed and 41/47 Bow Road closed to the public in 2006, with the remainder of buildings in 2007/2008. Whilst some staff will be needed at alternative locations there will be an overall reduction in staff. The majority of staffing reductions will occur in 2007/2008, with lease cost reductions in 2008/2009.</p>			
<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>			
	There should be no service implications arising from these savings.			
<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>			
	<p>All staffing reductions will be managed in accordance with the Council's procedures for handling organisational change and in anticipation of the impact of the Accommodation Strategy over recent months vacant posts have only been filled by agency / temporary staff in order to maximise the scope for minimising the impact of this change on permanent staff.</p>			



**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>					
Phase I of a review of the FM structure commenced in 2005 and consultation will continue during 2006 in relation to the main element of staffing reduction.						
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>					
There should be no effect on other Directorates.						
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could present this saving being achieved:</b>					
Any staffing review has risks associated with it. These principally relate to the time necessary to conclude consultations to achieve the deemed start date for the new structure.						
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency / value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency / better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured</b>					
The Council's Office Accommodation Strategy is designed to be more efficient and to deliver best value for money by reducing the number of properties occupied and by occupying properties which are more fit for purpose and hence less expensive to run. Initial saving can now be realised on the basis of progress to date on implementing that strategy and will occur in 2006/2007. The remaining savings will accrue in 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 detailed programmes and timescales for finalising these savings are in preparation.						
<b>Is this?</b>		<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>					
None						

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/EC/06**

<b>TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:</b>		Structural adjustments within Facilities Management		
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>		Environment & Culture		
<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>		Property & Facilities Management	<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	Graeme Peacock
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION:</b>				
	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>Saving</b>		
	<b>2005/2006 £000</b>	<b>2006/2007 £000</b>	<b>2007/2008 £000</b>	<b>2008/2009 £000</b>
<b>General Fund</b>		95	95	95
<b>HRA</b>				
<b>Other</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>		95	95	95
<b>1.</b>	<b>Details of saving option:</b>			
	There have been a number of changes of roles and responsibilities within the Facilities Management Team over recent months and one further change is planned in respect of procurement and contract management. On the basis of these changes staffing reductions are possible			
<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>			
	It is not anticipated that these changes will have any impact on service delivery.			
<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>			
	All staffing reductions will be managed in accordance with the Council's procedures for handling organisational change and in anticipation of the change vacancies have been held to minimise the impact on permanent staff.			
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>			
	Consultation on review proposals will be conducted to ensure the new structure can become operational on 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2006			

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/EC/06</b>
------------------------------------

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>				
There should be no effect on other Directorates.					
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could present this saving being achieved:</b>				
Any staffing review has risks associated with it, these principally relate to the time necessary to conclude consultations in time to achieve the desired start date for the new structure.					
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency / value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency / better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured</b>				
As a result of changing rules and responsibilities the Facilities Management team have been able to deliver the same level of service with reduced resources with a consequential reduction in recharges to service users from April 2006.					
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				
None					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/EC/07**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Landscape Architects - Reduction Of Subsidy

**DIRECTORATE:** Environment & Culture

**SERVICE AREA:** Parks & Play; Sport & Recreation; Arts & Events; Mile End Park  
**LEAD OFFICER:** Geoff Smith

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	79	35	35	35
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	79	35	35	35

**1. Details of saving option:**

The Landscape Architect Service generates fees to cover most of its operating costs. However, a proportion of the costs of the service is currently met through the revenue budget to support non fee-earning activities. This includes work such as strategy development, Green Flag project work and planning related work.

This savings proposal is achieved through improved efficiencies in the operation of the service, through the introduction of new technology and procurement arrangements.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

New operational arrangements will provide more efficient and effective delivery of landscape projects.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

New technologies and operating methodologies will have staff development implications.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Upgrade of current information systems.

Delivery of an appropriate training programme.

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/EC/07</b>
------------------------------------

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>				
None					
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>				
The proposal is linked to the Council's XP roll out programme in relation to the provision of hardware to support improved design and information handling capacity. Delays in the programme roll out would reduce the ability to meet the proposed targets					
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>				
The Landscape Service is project based provision, handling a range of capital, revenue and externally funded improvement schemes. A range of procedures and recording activities operate in relation to such projects, and these will be used to measure and ensure improvements in service delivery.					
Is this?	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="width: 40px; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="width: 40px; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				
None					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/EC/08**

<b>TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:</b> Review of Licensing				
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b> Environment & Culture				
<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Trading Standards and Environmental Health (Commercial)		<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b> Colin Perrins		
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION:</b>				
	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>Saving</b>		
	<b>2005/2006 £000</b>	<b>2006/2007 £000</b>	<b>2007/2008 £000</b>	<b>2008/2009 £000</b>
	437	60	60	60
	<b>General Fund</b>			
	<b>HRA</b>			
<b>Other</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>	437	60	60	60
<b>1.</b>	<b>Details of saving option:</b>			
<p>During 2005 it was necessary to manage the transition stage of implementing the new licensing regime. The transitional stage meant the Council was partially administering two licensing regimes. From November 2005 the old regime expired and the new regime become fully operational. A review of the new responsibilities took place during September and October 05 to assess the needs and demands of the new regime.</p> <p>The current transitional resourcing was based on best evidence available at the time but the review has identified ways of streamlining both frontline and management resourcing.</p>				
<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>			
None				
<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>			
Savings will be made through staff reductions which will be managed in accordance with the Council's procedures on handling organisational change. Currently there are a number of staff on temporary contracts within the service.				
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>			
Implementation of the review of the Licensing Team				

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:  
**SAV/EC/08**

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>			
None				
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>			
Any staffing review has risks associated with it. These principally relate to the time necessary to conclude consultations to achieve the deemed start date for the new structure.				
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>			
Any review process will be on the basis that service performance will not be affected. Service performance indicators will be used to assess performance and service standards				
Is this?	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>			
None				

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/EC/09**

<b>TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:</b>		Review of Trading Standards, Consumer Advice, Food and Health and Safety			
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>		Environment & Culture			
<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>		Trading Standards and Environmental Health (Commercial)	<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b> Colin Perrins		
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION:</b>					
		<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>Saving</b>		
		<b>2005/2006 £000</b>	<b>2006/2007 £000</b>	<b>2007/2008 £000</b>	<b>2008/2009 £000</b>
	<b>General Fund</b>	1,938	40	40	40
	<b>HRA</b>				
	<b>Other</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>	1,938	40	40	40	
<b>1.</b>	<b>Details of saving option:</b>				
	<p>Trading Standards and Environmental Health (Commercial) will be carrying out a number of reviews based on the need to address</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruitment and retention</li> <li>Implementation of Consumer Direct</li> <li>Transfer of functions and responsibilities to the Corporate Contact Centre.</li> </ul> <p>The review process has started with a review of Food Safety and Health &amp; Safety and a review of Trading Standards and Consumer Advice. The review will try to reconcile</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the need to make the authority more attractive to potential applicants</li> <li>retain current staff</li> <li>look at cashable and non cashable savings</li> <li>ensure that the service levels are not adversely affected.</li> </ul>				
<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>				
	Savings will be made at managerial tiers with front line service provision being unaffected.				
<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>				
	Any staffing reductions will be handled in accordance with the Council's procedures for handling organisational change				
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>				
	Service reviews to be implemented				



**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/EC/09**

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>				
None					
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>				
Any staffing review has risks associated with it. These principally relate to the time necessary to conclude consultations to achieve the deemed start date for the new structure.					
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>				
<p>Any review process will be on the basis that service performance will not be affected. Service performance indicators will be used to assess performance and service standards</p>					
Is this?	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 40px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				
None					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/EC/10**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Cultural Services Review

**DIRECTORATE:** Environment & Culture

**SERVICE AREA:** Parks & Play; Sport & Recreation; Arts & Events; Mile End Park  
**LEAD OFFICER:** Ray Gerlach

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	6,022	55	55	55
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	6,022	55	55	55

**1. Details of saving option:**

The Cultural Services division is made up of 5 service areas: Parks & Play; Sport & Recreation; Arts & Events; Idea Stores/Libraries; Mile End Park. There have been various minor adjustments to structures over the past seven years, but with the introduction of a new leisure management contract and a best value review of the Parks service it was felt appropriate to review the overall structure. The current review excludes the Idea Stores as a separate staffing re-structuring was only recently completed. The review was completed on 31.12.2005 and staff are now being consulted on the outcome. Efficiency savings of 55K have been identified.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

The review has identified improved efficiencies and will also allow for a degree of re-investment where appropriate. This will not affect the capacity to deliver the current levels of service.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

The review is being managed in line with the Council's procedures on managing organisational change and any efficiencies will be targeted at vacancies within the services.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Completion of the review before March 2006

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/EC/10**

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>		
None.			
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>		
Any staffing review has risks associated with it. These principally relate to the time necessary to conclude consultations to achieve the deemed start date for the new structure.			
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>		
Reduction in the overall staffing budget without any loss of service will give an increase in overall efficiency.			
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>		

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/EC/11**

<b>TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:</b>		Efficiencies through increased generic working and reduced use of agency and temporary staff			
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>		Environment and Culture			
<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>		Street Management	<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b> John Palmer		
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION:</b>					
	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>Saving</b>			
	<b>2005/2006 £000</b>	<b>2006/2007 £000</b>	<b>2007/2008 £000</b>	<b>2008/2009 £000</b>	
	General Fund	3,960	185	265	300
	HRA				
	Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	3,960	185	265	300	
<b>1.</b>	<b>Details of saving option:</b>				
<p>There has recently been a comprehensive re-structure of the Street Management Division. A further reduction in the use of agency and temporary staff, currently assisting in the Division's work combined with introducing new more generic working practices means that we can gain cashable efficiencies without impairing the effectiveness of the Division.</p> <p>a) Incorporating the Streetworks team into the LETS teams and getting more cross-over in enforcement activities</p> <p>b) Deploying mobile computers for reporting defects thereby streamlining the reporting-in process</p> <p>c) Re-defining the geographical responsibilities of the Highways Inspectors and using the advantages of planned inspections over re-active inspections</p> <p>d) Changing the balance of the Waste Management section to introduce a less costly but more focussed role into the contract management arm</p> <p>e) Reviewing the way that the road safety message is delivered to the public</p>					
<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will get a closer liaison between Streetworks enforcement and LETS teams enviro-crime enforcement by combining some functions.</li> <li>• More efficient working by being more business-like and effective in reporting defects using new technology – streamlining and reducing administrative process</li> <li>• Increased focus on core transportation business and making the best use of external grant funding.</li> <li>• Re-defining the exact duties of the Highways Inspectors in the light of the comprehensive monitoring activities of the LETS teams producing a more integrated monitoring regime.</li> <li>• Strengthening the contract management capacity by bringing in a less costly specialist to work closely with waste management and recycling contractors</li> </ul>					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/EC/11**

<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>		
Savings involve reducing the numbers of agency and temporary staff.			
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>		
Ceasing use of the services of a number of agency and temporary staff. The enhancements to generic working and embedding of new technology will be implemented on a phased basis to ensure continuity of service.			
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>		
Some LETS teams activities are for Housing Management and Horticulture, these will benefit from the increased co-ordination in enforcement and the increased efficiency from using mobile computers.			
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>		
None			
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>		
Number of enforcement actions Numbers of reports of defects Enhanced performance by contractors as measured by the joint targets in the partnership agreements			
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>		
None			

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/EC/12**

<b>TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:</b>		Review of Support Arrangements for Managers		
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>		Environment & Culture		
<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>		Cross directorate	<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	Alex Cosgrave
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION:</b>				
	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>Saving</b>		
	<b>2005/2006</b>	<b>2006/2007</b>	<b>2007/2008</b>	<b>2008/2009</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
<b>General Fund</b>	1,354	60	60	60
<b>HRA</b>				
<b>Other</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>	1,354	60	60	60
<b>1.</b>	<b>Details of saving option:</b>			
<p>The Directorate's support services to managers are currently provided from 3 separate locations across the Borough (Mulberry Place, Southern Grove Lodge and Bow Road). This has resulted in a number of systems, processes and procedures for a range of cross directorate requirements being duplicated.</p> <p>In early 2006 the majority of the Directorate's functions will relocate to a single floor at Anchorage House.</p> <p>This will allow for streamlining of support arrangements for managers with the possible creation of a Director's office. The overall result will allow for economies of scale in terms of support service staff.</p> <p>Initial scoping indicates that efficiency savings of £60k can be achieved.</p>				
<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>			
Streamlining of support, reduced duplication, improved service quality and reduced cost.				
<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>			
Any staffing reductions will be managed in accordance with the Council's procedures for handling organisational change.				

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/EC/12</b>
------------------------------------

<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>				
Review structure of administrative and support service arrangements within Directorate.					
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>				
None					
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could present this saving being achieved:</b>				
Delays in move to Anchorage House, delays in undertaking structural review. Any staffing review has risks associated with it. These principally relate to the time necessary to conclude consultations to achieve the deemed start date for the new structure.					
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency / value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency / better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured</b>				
This proposal is considered to be a cashable efficiency saving in line with the Gershon agenda in that improved outcomes and quality will be achieved at a reduced cost level.					
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				
None					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Review of Directorate Business Processes

**DIRECTORATE:** Development & Renewal

**SERVICE AREA:** Development & Building Control/  
Major Projects Development/  
Strategy and Innovation      **LEAD OFFICER:** Emma Peters

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	988	30	40	70
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>988</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>70</b>

**1. Details of saving option:**

We are reviewing business processes as part of our relocation to Anchorage House. The review will consider how procedures can be streamlined through co-location, more effective utilisation of e-government solutions, and digitisation, with the aim of reducing the service overheads associated with administrative and technical support.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

A key aim of the review will be to support the delivery of sustainable service improvements, through the provision of more effective and efficient systems and processes.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

Savings may necessitate overall establishment reductions, but it is anticipated that these can be accommodated through deletion of unfilled posts.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

The initial review will be undertaken as part of the Directorate relocation and will identify where the efficiency savings will be delivered. Details of the service areas and their required savings will then be incorporated into the finalised Directorate budget for 2006/7, and budget planning process for the following two years.



**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>		
	None		
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>		
	Capacity of existing services to absorb the savings.		
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>		
	We will deliver on our key performance indicators at less cost in real terms – measured through lower unit costs and continued improvement of priority performance indicators.		
	<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>		

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Review of Directorate Support Services

**DIRECTORATE:** Development and Renewal

**SERVICE AREA:** Resources

**LEAD OFFICER:** Chris Holme

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	980	30	35	40
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	980	30	35	40

**1. Details of saving option:**

We will review the provision of Directorate based information and support services, with a focus on improved utilisation of IT, e-procurement and records management.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

The review will consider the level of service required to support sustainable improvements to front line services, and ensure effective and timely delivery of corporate information requirements. The saving will require increased efficiency of service delivery and effective prioritisation of available resources in line with key stakeholder requirements.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

The saving is likely to require the deletion on one post. This loss of resource will be accommodated through improvements in the efficiency of working processes and procedures.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

We will review key financial and other information support services to assess how they can be provided more efficiently, through more effective utilisation of IT, e-procurement and improved records management. This will take place in parallel with the budget process, and the relocation of the Directorate.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>		
	None.		
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>		
	Capacity of the service to absorb the savings.		
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>		
	The cost to front-line services of Directorate-based support services will be reduced in real terms, enabling improved unit cost indicators across services		
	Is this?	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b>
		<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>		

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Procurement of professional agency staff

**DIRECTORATE:** Development & Renewal

**SERVICE AREA:** Development & Building Control/  
Major Project Development/  
Strategy & Innovation      **LEAD OFFICER:** Emma Peters

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	280	11	69	108
HRA				
Other	70			
<b>TOTAL</b>	350	11	69	108

**1. Details of saving option:**

We are in the process of developing a framework agreement for the procurement of our core professional services. These include planning, property, transport and building control specialist staff. The agreement will be tendered in accordance with European procurement regulations. In the short-term we envisage a small saving through more efficient procurement – however in the longer term it is envisaged that the utilisation of agency support across all services will be reduced.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

In the short-term, more efficient procurement of agency staff should enable continuation of current progress in performance improvement. However, in the longer term, the level of savings required may significantly impact the delivery of key development and building control targets.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

In the longer term there will be a need for improved efficiency of key Directorate processes to ensure that the permanent establishment is able to deliver the continued service improvements with a reduced number of agency staff.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Work is in progress to develop service briefs, which will form part of the tender documentation. New contractual arrangements should be in place early in the new financial year. At the same time we will develop an action plan for delivering a managed approach to effectively reducing overall agency staff.

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/DR/03</b>
------------------------------------

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>
-----------	---

None.

<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>
-----------	---

- Procurement exercise does not deliver savings
- Inability to identify areas where reductions in agency staff will not result in deterioration of key performance indicators

<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>
-----------	---

The proposal will reduce overall costs of service delivery, and hence unit costs.

Is this?      **Gershon Cashable  
efficiency**

<b>Yes</b>
------------

**Non-Gershon  
Saving**

--

<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>
-----------	--

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

<b>TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:</b>		Improved rent collection		
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>		Housing		
<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>		Homelessness		<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b> Colin Cormack
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION:</b>				
	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>Saving</b>		
	<b>2005/2006 £000</b>	<b>2006/2007 £000</b>	<b>2007/2008 £000</b>	<b>2008/2009 £000</b>
<b>General Fund</b>	1,614	133	269	678
<b>HRA</b>				
<b>Other</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>				
<b>1.</b>	<b>Details of saving option:</b>			
	Success in the homeless prevention combined with improving Housing Benefit performance will lead to improvement in income collection.			
<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>			
	Improved service will be achieved through action outlined in section 4.			
<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>			
	None			
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>			
	Continued success in homeless prevention agenda and improvement in Housing Benefit performance.			
	<i>Preventing homelessness and meeting the need of vulnerable residents through: delivery of actions and activities identified in the Homelessness Strategy and Supporting People Strategy such as:</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Increased cross sector working to prevent homelessness;</li> <li>➤ Use of family and landlord mediation as a prevention method;</li> <li>➤ Fast tracking housing benefit claims;</li> <li>➤ Family Rent Deposit Scheme to help households into private sector accommodation;</li> <li>➤ revision to the criteria for allocation of and the referral and access routes to supported housing and further work to ensure move on accommodation can be achieved from schemes to make best use of available resources;</li> </ul>			

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

- revision to referral and access arrangements for floating support, to provide some specialist mental health support, as well as generic support, particularly targeting those from minority ethnic backgrounds who lack family and support networks.

*Benefits Service:* Historically this service has been one of the best in London and judged to be a four star service within the CPA assessment. The change mid year to a new IT system created difficulties and impacted on the results for the remainder of the year. Results have now improved significantly, and are expected to continue to. The Service aims to meet a target at the end of 05/06 of 35 days on average to process a claim, and this should be reduced to 34 days in 06/07, and 33 days in 07/08.

**5. Possible effect on other directorates:**

None

**6. Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved**

Increase in demand for homelessness service arising from factors outside Authority's control.  
Deterioration in benefits performance

**7. 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 collection rates will reduce level of debt and associated need for provision for bad debt.

Monitoring of rent arrears and assessment of bad debt provision required.

Is this? **Gershon Cashable efficiency**

**yes**

**Non-Gershon Saving**

**8. Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item**

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:

SAV/CE/01

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Communications

**DIRECTORATE:** Chief Executive's

**SERVICE AREA:** Communications

**LEAD OFFICER:** ACE

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	2,219	10	15	41
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	2,219	10	15	41

**1. Details of saving option:**

Rationalise use of photography – shared digital archive on the intranet and multiple uses.  
Estimate £5K in 06/07 then £10k per annum.  
Increase income target for commercial services £5k in 06/07 and in 07/08 then £31k in 08/09.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

Shared digital archive will improve availability and use of digital images.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

None

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Work to increase income  
Implementation of digital archive

**5. Possible effect on other directorates:**

Improved service to directors

**6. Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved**

Significant downturn in advertising market



<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09</b> <b>SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No:</b>
----------------------

<b>SAV/CE/01</b>
------------------

<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>			
	<p>Increased advertising income will reduce unit cost of EEL            Cost per digital image used will decrease without a reduction in the output or quality of the service.</p>			
Is this?	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>			

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:

SAV/CE/02

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Improving productivity in the Payroll Service

**DIRECTORATE:** Chief Executive's

**SERVICE AREA:** Human Resources - Payroll      **LEAD OFFICER:** Cara Davani

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	1,468	31	63	96
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	1,468	31	63	96

**1. Details of saving option:**

The payroll section is being reviewed to deliver efficiencies and improved value for money. This will result in a reduction of the current staffing levels by four over a period of time.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

The payroll section was last restructured in 2003 and is currently undergoing another restructure which will achieve additional savings. The team now compares favourably with other London Boroughs according to recent IPF benchmarking data.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

This would result in a reduction of the establishment by 4 employees. The reduction will be achieved over a gradual period and will be implemented through the agreed procedures for handling organisation change.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Carry out restructure and consultation with staff in accordance with Council HR procedures.

**5. Possible effect on other directorates:**

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

Item Ref. No:

SAV/CE/02

<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>		
Although the restructure is designed to avoid any reduction in quality, reduced standards could result in a loss of external customers and associated income.			
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>		
This proposal will ultimately reduce the unit cost of the payroll service without affecting the quality and level of service.			
Is this?	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>		

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Productivity improvements – HR Strategy

**DIRECTORATE:** Chief Executives

**SERVICE AREA:** H R – Strategy **LEAD OFFICER:** Cara Davani

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	1,301	13	51	58
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	1,301	13	51	58

**1. Details of saving option:**

2006/07

The duties currently carried out by two posts will be rationalised and consolidated resulting in the reduction of 0.5 FTE. This will be facilitated by greater use of the Intranet for routine HR processes.

2007/08

One senior HR advisor post will be deleted from the establishment

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/CE/03</b>
------------------------------------

<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>				
<p>All of the proposed savings above would be achieved by reduced staffing in the Human Resources Strategy Team. This would require half an administrative post being deleted which should not impact directly on service delivery. Reducing a senior human resources adviser post will require reallocation of duties amongst the remaining advisers.</p>					
<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>				
<p>The proposed saving would result in deleting half of one post (scale 5) from the Human Resources Strategy Team establishment in 2006/7 and a senior adviser post (PO4) in 2007/8.</p> <p>The reductions would be implemented using the Council's agreed procedures for handling organisational change.</p>					
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>				
<p>The team will need to implement the actions that resulted from the EFQM assessment process to make documentation and advice more accessible and reduce the time spent by the Human Resources Strategy Team in dealing with enquiries and requests for advice.</p>					
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>				
<p>The proposed savings could reduce the capacity to respond to requests for advice from senior managers and Directorate Human Resources Teams and support major improvement or change projects.</p>					
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>				
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>				
<p>The outputs currently achieved by senior human resources advisers will be achieved despite reducing the establishment by one post.</p> <p>The duties carried out by two administrative posts will also be combined and rationalised to enable duties to be undertaken by one post.</p>					
Is this?	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; border: 1px solid black; width: 50px; height: 30px;"><b>YES</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; border: 1px solid black; width: 50px; height: 30px;"> </td> </tr> </table>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	
<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>			
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				
<p>Greater use will be made of the Council's intranet to make Human Resources policies, procedures and guidance notes and standard forms more accessible.</p>					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:

SAV/CE/04

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Reduced Insurance Claims

**DIRECTORATE:** Chief Executives

**SERVICE AREA:** Risk Management                      **LEAD OFFICER:** Richard Ellis

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	488	22	52	82
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	488	22	52	82

**1. Details of saving option:**

The savings will be achieved by implementing developing best practice to reduce inflated or invalid insurance claims. The savings will be achieved in the reduction of pay-outs and consequently in the recharge to directorates.

The project will include the implementation of a whistle-blowing hotline jointly with other Boroughs to share costs and intelligence, and the employment of a dedicated claims investigator. The costs will be met from the savings, and the savings above are therefore net of those costs.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

The project will increase the ability to service legitimate claims.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

The creation of one post funded from savings.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Develop Job Description for claims investigator post, advertise and fill (internally).  
Develop partnership with other Boroughs.  
Contract to deliver whistle blowing hotline.  
Advertise hotline.

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/CE/04</b>
------------------------------------

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>					
None						
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>					
The level of total claims received is uncertain, as is the level of inflated claims. However, experience in other organisations shows a reduction in claims of up to 25% (volume not value). The saving is estimated based on achieving a 5% reduction year on year on small and personal injury claims. The estimate allows for the impact of Housing Choice and other initiatives to reduce claims.						
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>					
<p>By weeding out fraudulent or exaggerated claims, the Council will be meeting its legal liabilities at its true cost. The reduction in the level of claims will assist the efficient processing of genuine claims. The adoption of this project will influence our insurers risk assessment and will help maintain value for money in insurance premiums.</p> <p>The efficiency will be measured by the recording of rejected claims.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;"><b>Is this?</b></td> <td style="width: 30%;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 30%;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>		<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>					

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

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

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Audit & Inspection Fees saving

**DIRECTORATE:** Chief Executive's

**SERVICE AREA:** Corporate Finance                      **LEAD OFFICER:** Alan Finch

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	453	108	108	108
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	453	108	108	108

**1. Details of saving option:**

Audit Commission charges are partly based on the size of the authority and partly on the level of perceived risk. Tower Hamlets is a 'three star' and improving authority which has been receiving positive reports on its financial management and governance arrangements. As a consequence charges for external audit and inspection have reduced.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

There are no service implications.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

There are no staffing implications arising from this saving.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

No action is required to achieve this saving other than to maintain current standards of financial management and governance. The scale of fees is set by the Audit Commission and notified to authorities.



**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:

SAV/CE/05

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>		
None. All Directorates will have to play a part in maintaining current levels of performance.			
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>		
It is possible that, if the progress that has taken place within the authority is reversed, the charge could increase again. However, in general, the Commission is aiming at charging less for audit and inspection by introducing 'lighter touch' inspections and encouraging managed audit and self-assessment. It is more likely that further improvements in the Council's performance will lead to further fee reductions.			
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>		
The saving represents a cashable efficiency, as the reduction in costs will not affect services to the community.			
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>		
Indirectly, further improvements in financial management and governance and service performance would improve the efficiency of the organisation by reducing the risks facing the authority, enabling a lighter touch monitoring regime and freeing resources for other purposes.			

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/CE/06**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Rationalisation of Admin Support & Increased Income from Council Tax and Business rate Defaulters

**DIRECTORATE:** Chief Executives – Resources

**SERVICE AREA:** Revenues

**LEAD OFFICER:** Paul McDermott

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	939	43	43	43
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	939	43	43	43

**1. Details of saving option:**

- a) Reorganisation of the group's management responsibilities has enabled more efficient administrative support to be provided to a streamlined management team.
- b) Increasing the income anticipated from the imposition and collection of statutory costs as a result of the non-payment of council tax and business rates.  
The Council does not currently apply for the maximum summons or liability order costs agreed by the Inner London Magistrates Court Service. The level of costs presently imposed for council tax are £55 for a summons and £20 for the liability order. These levels could be adjusted to £60 and £20 respectively.  
Business rates costs are £110 and £50, and these would be raised to £120 and £55.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

None

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

There are no staffing implications as the post to be deleted recently became vacant.

Residents in receipt of 100% council tax benefit will not be affected by these increases as they are not liable to pay council tax. Officers will continue to have discretion to waive these costs on the grounds of hardship or other mitigating circumstances where the additional charge appears excessive or unreasonable.

There are no other service implications as existing procedures and processes will remain unchanged by the increase in the level of court costs imposed.

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/CE/06</b>
------------------------------------

<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>
-----------	---

A formal consultation process has been carried out specifically dealing with the deletion of this post and there is no further action required.

Agreement will be sought with the Chief Clerk at Thames Magistrates Court to increase the level of costs applied in respect of these actions.

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>
-----------	---

<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>
-----------	---

The level of late or non-payment affects this income. If all council tax and business rates are paid on, or before the date it is due, no court action will be necessary therefore no additional costs can be imposed. This option assumes that the number of default cases remain stable which has been the case in previous financial years when costs have been increased.

<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>
-----------	---

The team have benefited from the introduction of document imaging and workflow technology which has enabled streamlining of the admin support provision.

Is this?      **Gershon Cashable  
efficiency**

**Non-Gershon  
Saving**

<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>
-----------	--

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:

**SAV/CE/07**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Reduced staffing costs following implementation of Orator Voice recognition / workforce planning software

**DIRECTORATE:** Chief Executive's

**SERVICE AREA:** Customer Access

**LEAD OFFICER:** Head of Customer Access

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	1,508	47	96	145
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	1,508	47	96	145

**1. Details of saving option:**

With the recent implementation of the Orator voice recognition software, we anticipate being able to reduce internal calls to the switchboard. Currently they represent 20% of all calls. We would expect one post to be freed up as a result.

In 2007-9 greater savings will arise through the utilisation of workforce planning software enabling the council to staff at the optimum level across access channels.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

None

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

None – It is expected that savings will be achieved through natural wastage/turnover

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Implement Orator and workforce planning software.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:

SAV/CE/07

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>		
	Staff will need to use the on line directory or intranet		
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>		
	Resistance to change Technology problems		
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>		
	Input costs (staffing) will reduce whilst the same level of information/service will be available.		
	Is this?	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>		

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/CE/08**

<b>TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:</b>		Reduction in one post, additional income from Nationality checking			
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>		Chief Executive's			
<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>		Registration of Births, Deaths & Marriages	<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b> Sara Williams		
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION:</b>					
	<b>Current Budget</b>	<b>Saving</b>			
	<b>2005/2006 £000</b>	<b>2006/2007 £000</b>	<b>2007/2008 £000</b>	<b>2008/2009 £000</b>	
	General Fund	348	41	55	83
	HRA				
	Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	348	41	55	83	
<b>1.</b>	<b>Details of saving option:</b>				
<u>2006/07 and 2007/08</u> A restructuring of the service has been undertaken resulting in a net reduction of one PO3 post. Additionally, a new income stream has become available by the introduction of a Nationality checking service (a pre-requisite of becoming a British Citizen and a valued service to local residents), which commenced in the autumn of 2005.					
<b>2.</b>	<b>Service implications of saving:</b>				
<u>2006/07 and 2007/08</u> Existing work resulting from the saving of the PO3 post to be subsumed into other work packages and some realignments of roles will be necessary. Work arising from the Nationality Checking Service is commensurate with the grades of existing staff.					

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/CE/08</b>
------------------------------------

<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>					
<p><u>2006/07 and 2007/08</u> Reduction of one PO3 post achieved through redundancy/early retirement of Service Manager following reorganisation - already complete</p>						
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>					
To commence a restructuring exercise and consult staff/Trade Unions.						
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>					
None.						
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>					
None.						
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>					
<p>The proposal reduces the staffing resource in the Registrars' Service with no reduction in workload or customer service.</p> <p>The efficiency improvement will be measured via the Performance Management process and customer feedback.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;"><b>Is this?</b></td> <td style="width: 30%;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 30%;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>		<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>					
The proposal reduces the staffing resource in the Registrars' Service with no reduction in workload or customer service.						

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:

SAV/CE/09

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Crime Reduction Services

**DIRECTORATE:** Chief Executive's

**SERVICE AREA:** Crime Reduction Services      **LEAD OFFICER:** Olivia McLeod

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	677	16	31	48
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	677	16	31	48

**1. Details of saving option:**

We will save by working more smartly firstly in the Crime Strategy and Performance Team and then more widely across the service making better use of technology and thereby reducing the need for administrative support and saving on the staffing budget. In 2006/07 this will enable us to reduce the funding for admin support by £16k. The planned implementation of centralised systems around data-sharing, communications and financial support, plus greater co-location should support the phased reduction of administrative staff.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

Existing post-holders will need to work flexibly to cover tasks such as minuting and meeting organisation.

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

A full time admin post (currently being filled by agency staff) will be reduced to part time.

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Reprofiling of 2006/07 staff budget for CSP and reduction in hours of current agency staff.



<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/CE/09</b>
------------------------------------

<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>					
None.						
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>					
None						
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>					
<p>Working smarter – for example replacing manual information sharing with electronic systems, pooling resources on administrative tasks, and working in a flexible, multi-tasking way – will make the service as a whole more efficient and provide better value for money. We will demonstrate this by meeting our performance objectives while making the saving.</p>						
Is this?	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 30px; vertical-align: middle;"><b>X</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 100px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 30px; vertical-align: middle;"></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>X</b>		<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	
<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>X</b>		<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>			
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>					
None						

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/CE/10**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Democratic and Members' Support savings

**DIRECTORATE:** Chief Executive

**SERVICE AREA:** Democratic Renewal & Engagement      **LEAD OFFICER:** Sara Williams

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	2,821	22	32	87
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	2,821	22	32	87

**1. Details of saving option: EITHER**

2006/07

- Rationalise administrative support to enable deletion of vacant 0.5 admin post (savings=£13K) (post currently supports Consultation and Involvement Team)
- Transfer MPA funded resource for supporting Borough Policing Forum to Crime Reduction Services, removing council subsidy of £9k

**2. Service implications of saving:**

Reduction in admin support will require greater efficiency and self-servicing, use of IT. Transfer of MPA-funded resource will produce greater synergy in community engagement on policing matters.

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No: SAV/CE/10</b>
------------------------------------

<b>3.</b>	<b>Staffing implications of saving:</b>				
06/07 change will result in non-filling of a vacant post					
<b>4.</b>	<b>Action required to achieve saving:</b>				
Not recruiting to vacant admin post Restructuring MPA funded staff					
<b>5.</b>	<b>Possible effect on other directorates:</b>				
None immediate.					
<b>6.</b>	<b>Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>				
<b>7.</b>	<b>Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>				
Unit costs will reduce in the team					
Is this?	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding-right: 20px;"><b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 30px; vertical-align: middle;"><b>X</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; padding-left: 20px;"><b>Non-Gershon Saving</b></td> <td style="text-align: center; border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 30px; vertical-align: middle;"></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>	
<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>			
<b>8.</b>	<b>Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>				

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/CE/11**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Research and Scrutiny

**DIRECTORATE:** Chief Executive's

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

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	833	24	49	75
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	833	24	49	75

**1. Details of saving option:**

During the second year of its operation (05/06) Research and Scrutiny Team members (across all its functions) have had a strong training budget to develop their skills. This has benefited the Council as a whole as it helps reduce the need for consultants and ensures the range of performance management, research and scrutiny tasks can be conducted in-house. In future it will be this work itself which will develop the overall skills of the section. This will also reduce any reliance on the use of outside consultants to support best value or other review work. A reduction in the relevant budget will achieve required saving of £24k in 2006/07.

**2. Service implications of saving:**

Reducing training, consultancy and support costs in 2006/07 and 2007/08 will require discipline and effective monitoring to ensure that saving is implemented. However to date there has been a number of 'start up' costs incurred in the continuing establishment of the team. The demand for this expenditure will lessen as the skills of team members continue to develop. Research and Scrutiny will aim to ensure that there are no direct service implications in achieving this saving. The greater development of the Team's skills will also enable the opportunity for reducing team numbers.

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

Item Ref. No:

SAV/CE/11

<b>3. Staffing implications of saving:</b>	There would be no staffing implications in 2006/07 or 2007/08.		
<b>4. Action required to achieve saving:</b>	Improved management of training, consultancy and support costs will continue to be necessary including staff awareness of the importance of achieving the saving.  The proposals include a contingency to help delivery.		
<b>5. Possible effect on other directorates:</b>	There should be no immediate impact on other directorates.		
<b>6. Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved</b>	There are no significant risk factors in respect of this budget in 2006/07.		
<b>7. Efficiency/ value for money. How will this proposal contribute towards greater efficiency/ better value for money and how will the efficiency improvement be measured.</b>	This proposal will demand that existing resources are used more effectively. In addition enhancing the skills of team members will be evidenced by external and internal inspection of the services provided as well as those services affected by the support provided to them by Research and Scrutiny.		
<b>Is this?</b>	<b>Gershon Cashable efficiency</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-Gershon Saving</b>
<b>8. Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item</b>	It is unclear at this stage the extent of any potential non-cashable efficiency. This will require further development alongside the implementation of proposed Housing Choice and other Gershon efficiency savings.		

**BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09  
SAVING OPTIONS**

**Item Ref. No:  
SAV/CE/12**

**TITLE OF SAVING OPTION:** Consolidation and rationalisation of ICT infrastructure and software licences.

**DIRECTORATE:** Chief Executive's

**SERVICE AREA:** ICT **LEAD OFFICER:** Jim Roberts

**FINANCIAL INFORMATION:**

	Current Budget	Saving		
	2005/2006 £000	2006/2007 £000	2007/2008 £000	2008/2009 £000
General Fund	9,107	158	392	545
HRA				
Other				
<b>TOTAL</b>	9,107	158	392	545

**1. Details of saving option:**

Consolidation of infrastructure around Microsoft's Active Directory will allow streamlining of Novell and Zen licences (£25K). Centralised licence and contracts management including faster turnaround in reclaiming of leaver licences and re-assigning to new ICT users (new starters) will help control license costs by a further £70k.

The current budget allows for hardware and software including working tools and consumables. New PCs and laptops will be acquired through the Corporate Procurement arrangements and the hardware and software budget can be reduced by £40k to reflect this.

In addition to the maintenance cost of £22K and upgrade work of £6K for the Council Tax system, there is a supplementary provision within the ICT budget of £23K for enhancements and customisation of interfaces. The system has recently been upgraded, and this supplementary provision is no longer considered necessary.

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

<b>Item Ref. No:</b>
----------------------

<b>SAV/CE/12</b>
------------------

**2007/08**

Consolidation of telecommunications lines by using CCTV technology, streamlining software licences and hardware maintenance, bulk printing processes and consolidating Directorate and Corporate ICT.

**2008/09**

Potentially, savings of £153K have been identified at line by line level through future consolidation of contracts, licenses and maintenance on the back of simplified infrastructure

**2. Service implications of saving:**

The following licences are affected:

Novell: This saving will be made through not upgrading Novell and migrating to Microsoft and Active Directory.

Lotus Notes savings will be made by reclaiming and re-assigning leaver licences to new users more quickly.

As long as ICT equipment purchased is of standard specification there will be limited implications for users.

All bespoke developments and enhancements to the Council Tax system will need to be kept to minimum to keep the software as close as possible to standard product. Working practices would where necessary need to be changed to fit the standard version. This would also assist in deploying application upgrades more quickly.

Any significant work which could not be funded by NNDR & Community Charge and Central Reserves would need to be appropriately represented with a bid during the budgetary process (these are normally one-off costs).

**3. Staffing implications of saving:**

None

**4. Action required to achieve saving:**

Putting in place the processes to reclaim leaver user licences and associated storage.

Planning the migration to Microsoft and Active Directory.

Non renewal of existing licensing agreements.

Review hardware and software refresh requirements.

Ensure that business cases are made to ICT for higher specification desktop machines.

Ensure that any specialist high specification machine requirements are covered by relevant budgetary provision.

<b>BUDGET 2006/07 – 2008/09 SAVING OPTIONS</b>
--

Item Ref. No:

SAV/CE/12

Council to increase its profile in IBS's national C.Tax user group to influence the direction of future development of the C.Tax product. Any significant enhancement or upgrade development outside the standard would have to be met either from the client budget or be planned in advance through submission of successful bid.

**5. Possible effect on other directorates:**

C.Tax and Benefits applications are closely connected; hence working practices in Benefits may need to change where new standard functionality differs from LBTH practices.

**6. Possible risk factors which could prevent this saving being achieved**

Unforeseen significant rise in software costs due to market consolidation.

Significant rise in new ICT users.

Unforeseen significant increase in level of business resilience and availability required.

Unforeseen significant rise in hardware and/or software due to market consolidation.

Significant change in PC refresh cycles due to applications and vendors requiring higher specification machines.

Unplanned, urgent statutory/legislative changes that require enhancements to system would need to be funded by C.Tax section.

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

Reduction in this budget will help control ICT spend per employee.

Is this?      **Gershon Cashable  
efficiency**

**Non-Gershon  
Saving**

**8. Please also give details of any non cashable Gershon efficiency associated with this item**