

**Highland Council
18 December 2014**

Revenue Budget 2015/16 – 2018/19

Details of Budget Savings

**Care & Learning
Transformation Projects**

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Court Reports		
Savings Name	Court Reports		
Budget (£m)	N/A	Staffing (FTE)	0

Reference C&L/1

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

It is proposed that charges be introduced for some court reports undertaken by social workers, for example step-parent adoptions. There are no implications for service delivery.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.010	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.010	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Detailed scoping is still to be completed to determine the level of charging and the mechanism but no major issues are anticipated regarding deliverability or risk.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – this is procedural

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact – this is procedural

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Reference	C&L/2
Activity Heading	Children's equipment				
Savings Name	Children's equipment				
Budget (£m)	£0.135m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduced expenditure on small items of equipment within the current equipment budget of £0.135m.

New procedures will be developed to rationalise spending.

The re-tendering process to find preferred suppliers for specialist equipment will limit the range of equipment purchased and give a better price for equipment. In addition, parents will be asked to purchase small and low cost items of equipment, likely to involve lesser levels of need, ranging in cost from £10-£100, with the upper limit being rare. ASN Equipment costs to families as a result of the savings will therefore be relatively small.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.025	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.025	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

The following Outcome will be supported by this action:

Working Together for the Economy (5) 'The Council will continue to be transparent in awarding contracts, and fair and efficient in settling our bills.'

Deliverability and Risks

The re-tendering process has already begun and it is expected that suppliers will be interested in tendering. There is a risk that no suppliers will tender to provide the full range of specialist equipment required, meaning that higher cost items will still need to be purchased elsewhere.

Given that the expenditure for parents will be small (between £10-£100), and will be for items most other parents would also purchase eg cutlery, scissors, software etc, it is expected that this aspect is deliverable.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

There is **potential negative impact** on children with additional support needs, including disabled children. With a smaller budget there will be less flexibility to purchase equipment for children and young people with additional

support needs. Families will also be asked to purchase smaller items of equipment that may have been previously purchased for them. Any impact will be mitigated through re-tendering to identify a preferred supplier which may limit the range and choice of equipment, but will enable the Council to purchase equipment that will still meet need, at a lower cost and therefore the remaining budget can be used more effectively.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

No rural impact.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Child's Plan Reviews		
Savings Name	Child's Plan Reviews		
Budget (£m)	£0.363m	Staffing (FTE)	5 QAROs and 6 clerical staff plus portion of shared business support

Reference C&L/3

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

There is a central team which manages and supports the process of child's plan reviews. It is intended that the processes are reviewed and simplified and therefore the staffing resources required can be reduced. The proposed reduction would be 1FTE Quality assurance and reviewing officer and 1FTE clerical assistant. The reduction would be managed via a service review

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.050	2
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.050	2

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

The deliverability of the savings is achievable through a service review. The current processes used by the team will be required to be revised in order to minimise any impact on the wider services through displacement of activity.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – internal management

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Fostering and Adoption		
Savings Name	Fostering and Adoption		
Budget (£m)	£3.637m	Staffing (FTE)	21.3

Reference C&L/5

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The proposal is to achieve the savings through a number of actions, totalling £50k in annual savings.

- The deletion of two part-time posts, one 0.5 in the North and one 0.3 in the West.
- Reduction in training costs for carers, making better use of online training, thereby reducing staff time and travel costs.
- Small reduction in allowances paid to prospective adopters when children are placed for adoption.
- Reduction in subsidy of Highlife Highland cards for carers.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.050	0.8
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.050	0.8

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

As the two part-time posts have been vacant for some time, the impact of deleting these from the establishment is clearly defined and no individual staff member would be at risk.

Reduction in support to carers would need to be discussed with carer groups.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

The impact of all of the proposals is minimal however consultation is required with carer groups.

In addition to these proposals financial support to carers will be reviewed for 2015/16 and proposals brought to Committee for approval regarding an inflationary uplift which has not been implemented in recent years. An EQIA will be carried out as part of the review.

http://www.highland.gov.uk/downloads/download/404/equality_impact_assessments

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Grow your own professionals		
Savings Name	Grow your own professionals		
Budget (£m)	N/A	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/6

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

In some professions there is a shortage of appropriately qualified candidates for vacant posts. It's proposed to offer support to a number of people to study and train to achieve qualifications in social work and nursing, specifically in relation to health visiting/Early years practitioners and school nurses.

The intention is to designate some vacant posts as traineeship, and offer financial and other support to staff to complete their professional training. The costs of this would be met from the budget for the vacant post, leaving a balance as a saving.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.100	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.100	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

This positively supports the aim of Getting it Right for Every Child and further enhancing the integration of children's services.

Deliverability and Risks

Detailed proposals are being worked up. The delivery of savings may not be feasible in year one (2015/16) as there will need to be some lead-in time and implementation will depend on suitable vacant posts being identified.

Consultation feedback

Summary

The majority of respondents across all three surveys saw this proposal as **a change for the better** or **may be a helpful change** for the wider community. Between a third and 40% within each survey believed the proposal **would make no difference** to them/their group or the wider community.

Across all three surveys, this proposal received amongst the lowest proportion of respondents noting that it **could cause some difficulty**.

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Potential positive impact – developing skills in Highland

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Potential positive impact – developing skills in Highland

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Youth Co-ordinators		
Savings Name	Youth Co-ordinators		
Budget (£m)	£0.137m	Staffing (FTE)	3 (Police staff)

Reference C&L/7

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The Youth Co-ordinator posts are service Police officers who work in a partnership role to support Children's Services. They are currently 100% funded by Highland Council. The proposal is to cease the funding for the posts, with discussions with Police Scotland to take place on future funding arrangements.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.137	N/A
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.137	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

There is a separate proposal to reduce the number of Resource Managers in the Youth Action Service. If the two proposals were both approved, this would lead to some operational difficulties in responding to concerns in relation to early offending behaviour. There would also be an additional pressure on other managers in Children's Services.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

There does not appear to be an alternative link between youths, social work, education, voluntary sector and Police Scotland, that would be focussing specifically on young offenders etc. The Public Protection Unit is based in Inverness, so there is likely to be a negative rural impact.

There is a separate proposal to reduce the number of Resource Managers in the Youth Action Service. If the two proposals were both approved, this would lead to some operational difficulties in managing the Child Concern process. There would also be an additional pressure on other managers in Children's Services.

http://www.highland.gov.uk/downloads/download/404/equality_impact_assessments

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

See above

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Childcare and Early Learning		
Savings Name	Childcare and Early Learning		
Budget (£m)	£13.074m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/8

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This proposal continues the process of rationalising early learning and childcare provision, to minimise duplication. This takes place across the year, as opportunities arrive, involving local consultations and partnership working with the 3rd and independent sector.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.150	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.150	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

This is achievable within the budget envelope for this service, being just over 1%.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

64% of Panel respondents noted that the proposal **would make no** difference to them but 50% indicated that it **could cause some difficulty** for the wider community.

Communities Panel – community groups

49% of groups indicated that the proposal **would make no difference** to them but just over half, 53%, noted that it **could cause some difficulty** for the wider community.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

52% of respondents noted that the proposal **would make no difference** to them but 58% reported that it **could cause some difficult** to the wider community.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No impact on provision for users

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact on provision for users

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Vacancy Management		
Savings Name	Vacancy Management		
Budget (£m)	N/A	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/9

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Where safe and feasible, increase the number of posts delayed when being filled on a permanent basis, adding to the existing accumulated vacancy management savings.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.200	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.200	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

This requires to be managed on an ongoing basis, taking account of service demands and local impact, and that it adds to the existing level of necessary vacancy management savings.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Care Homes		
Savings Name	Care Homes		
Budget (£m)	£0.750m	Staffing (FTE)	0

Reference C&L/10

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Recurring savings are achieved from the opening of new care homes in two Highland communities, replacing existing provision.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.750	0
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.750	

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

None

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i> <i>(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)</i>	

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i>	

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Training for children's services		
Savings Name	Training for children's services		
Budget (£m)	£0.242m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/11

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*
 Reduction in staff training budget, with training programmes being more integrated.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.020	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.020	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*
 None.

Deliverability and Risks

The training programme will be reviewed to ensure that statutory requirements are given top priority, and other training is prioritised to support business requirements.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact - internal efficiencies

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact - internal efficiencies

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Residential Properties		
Savings Name	Residential Properties		
Budget (£m)	£0.030m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/12

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Care and Learning has a number of residential properties currently on its account, including school houses, janitorial houses, etc. As reported recently to Committee, work is ongoing in relation to transferring management responsibility for these houses to Community Services, where the appropriate housing management expertise and resources reside.

Following transfer, the existing maintenance budgets within Care and Learning can be removed and taken as a budget saving.

From the perspective of tenants, the change in housing management responsibility should have no implications on the service they receive. It is expected that there are opportunities to improve the service, through the expertise Community Services can bring to the activity.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.030	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.030	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact.

Deliverability and Risks

The saving is dependent on agreeing the terms of transfer with Community Services, and making the necessary administrative arrangements to transfer properties, records, etc. Work on this is already underway as the proposal has already been reported to Committee.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Major school capital projects		
Savings Name	Major school capital projects		
Budget (£m)	£11.2m	Staffing (FTE)	226

Reference C&L/13

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The Council has a number of major school rationalisation projects underway, including the Fort William primary school projects and the Wick primary and Campus projects. The Council is also undertaking statutory consultations in relation to North Skye and Tain, the outcomes of which are still to be considered by Committee. These proposals, some of which remain subject to the outcome of statutory consultations, are anticipated to deliver revenue savings arising from staff cost and building cost savings. The proposed savings derive from the improved efficiency of the new facilities.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.150	4.5
2016/17	0.250	6.1
2017/18	0.200	3.6
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.600	14.2

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

The proposal has a positive impact, as relates to the programme commitment 'children and young people 8' and delivery of the Council's school building programme.

Deliverability and Risks

For the Fort William and Wick projects which are underway, the risks are considered low and relate primarily to timescales. Any slippage in delivery of the capital project, may delay the timing of savings to be delivered. In relation to North Skye and Tain, both these proposals are part of a statutory consultation, and final decisions have yet to be taken by the Council. If the proposals are not ultimately agreed, or alternative options approved, then the expected savings may not be achieved.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact - Internal efficiency

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact - Internal efficiency

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Estates Team		
Savings Name	Estates Team		
Budget (£m)	£0.230m	Staffing (FTE)	6

Reference C&L/16

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The Council's estates team provide support to the Service in relation to delivery of the Care and Learning capital programme, monitoring of the Development and Infrastructure S.A.M. capital programme, and delivery of maintenance (revenue) programmes.

Team members provide direct support to the Council's major capital projects, in particular major school projects which at this time includes; Fort William primary schools, Wick schools, Inverness Royal Academy, amongst others. The proposal will see staff time spent directly on specific capital projects recharged to the capital programme. Non-project specific work, as well as work associated with revenue projects, would continue to be charged to revenue.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.150	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.150	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact.

Deliverability and Risks

No issues to highlight.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Office Premises		
Savings Name	Office Premises		
Budget (£m)	£0.560m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/17

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The Care and Learning Service is responsible for a number of office premises occupied by service staff. The Council already has a programme in place to achieve savings from asset rationalisations. In parallel with this, the Care and Learning Service will look to achieve a 4% cost reduction on those premises it occupies.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.022	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.022	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact.

Deliverability and Risks

No particular risks to highlight.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Information, Support and ICT team		
Savings Name	Information, Support and ICT team		
Budget (£m)	£0.763m	Staffing (FTE)	3

Reference C&L/19

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The Council has a development budget, currently being used to meet the costs of the SEEMIS system implementation. On conclusion of that project, expected summer 2015, the budget can be released as a saving. As a result, this will limit scope for any future developments, though other corporate budgets may be available against which project bids could be considered.

Any staff impacted by the budget reduction are on temporary contracts/secondments, and the project posts would always have concluded at the end of the project in summer 2015.

In addition, for those team members who provide direct project support to capital projects, this time will in future be charged to the capital programme.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.220	3
2016/17	0.050	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.270	3

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

No issues to highlight.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Central Support		
Savings Name	Workforce Planning		
Budget (£m)	£0.608m	Staffing (FTE)	11

Reference C&L/20

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The Care and Learning's Workforce Planning team provide support to the Service in relation to school staffing matters, in particular; modelling future staffing requirements, recruitment and placement of staff, CPD and training, probationers, PSA deployment.

It is proposed to undertake a review, to identify savings and staff reductions over the medium term. Consideration would be given to alternative ways of delivering the support, process reviews and use of ICT, and prioritisation of workload.

Due to the important role the team play in managing school staffing and recruitment, and given the scale of school based staffing changes that could arise from other saving proposals, this particular saving is deferred until 2016/17 to ensure adequate support to the Service during this period of change.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.050	1
2017/18	0.050	1
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.100	2

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No direct impact.

Deliverability and Risks

The proposal relates to removing 2 FTE from the existing team and is dependent on the outcome of a future review of the function, with the aim of identifying efficiency improvements of alternative ways of delivering the service. The deliverability of the saving is therefore subject to the outcome of that review. The phasing of the saving, from 2016/17, gives the opportunity of time in which to undertake the review.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact - Internal efficiency

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact -Internal efficiency

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Catering		
Savings Name	Catering		
Budget	£4.6m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/22

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

- The proposal relates to additional 'commercial' income generation within the catering function.
- The proposal DOES NOT relate to charges for school meals
- Explore more vigorously business opportunities outwith council services, i.e. commercial and event catering
- Explore working with others in relation to income generation

- The proposal will have no impact on core service delivery.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.030	
2016/17	0.030	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.060	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

- Meet income targets; with reduced resources; reduced opportunities within council i.e. HC savings –no catering at training /reduction in welfare meals
- Need to continue to explore externally for business opportunities
- Profits margins require to be sustainable

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Catering		
Savings Name	Catering		
Budget (£m)	£4.6m	Staffing (FTE)	363

Reference C&L/23A

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

A number of options will be explored to achieve efficiency savings and cost reductions within the catering function. This will include consideration of:

- Increase School Meal Uptake
- Reduce waste : introduce waste ambassadors in schools; additional resources in dining room to encourage 'clearing the plate' and 'social experience'; expand pre- ordering of choices using band system; reduce portions when and where appropriate
- Reduce training budget
- Reduce marketing and publicity budget
- Reduce travel
- Reduce on-site training and coaching
- Reduce printing budget

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.085	
2016/17	0.085	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.170	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

- Need to ensure compliance with the School (Health Promotion and Nutrition)(Scotland)Act 2007
- Action required around customer satisfaction
- Reduced publicity to encourage uptake of meals and awareness to parents

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact - Internal efficiency

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact - Internal efficiency

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Cleaning		
Savings Name	Cleaning		
Budget (£m)	£4.8m	Staffing (FTE)	284

Reference C&L/23B&25

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

- This proposal relates to cost reduction within the school and building cleaning function.
- In the short-term (2015/16) the proposal is to identify a 4% saving from efficiency improvements and cost reductions, which may include:
 - Reduce cleaning materials budget: negotiate on costs with warehouse supplies (Community Services)
 - Reduce cleaning equipment budget: review / change supplier(s)
 - Relinquish loo of year awards and award status; alternatively look for sponsorship
 - Reduction in transport costs: sharing of vehicles; change to schedules; establishment visits; joint service multi-tasking roles
 - Reduced monitoring of service standards
- Over the medium term (2016/17), in addition to the proposals set out above, the proposal involves a more fundamental review and restructure of the cleaning function.
 - This approach would look at a range of options for delivering the cleaning function and could consider:
 - Review and restructure Cleaning & Facilities Management Services (CFM): formally integrate cleaning and facilities management personnel; one CFM budget; review job descriptions, roles and responsibilities – continue to expand the ethos of multi-tasking especially in rural areas
 - Income generation
 - Joint working – explore options to work with others, including existing Arms Length Organisations such as Highlife Highland, in future delivery models for cleaning. Benefits from sharing and reducing overheads; benefits of existing synergies while creating efficiencies; longer term staff synergies, leading to reduction in costs; potential savings in rates; staff morale.
 - Minimum 10% reduction in front line staff hours initially phased in with vacancy management to protect permanent staff thereafter implemented across all establishments. Office rationalisation will require staff to be redeployed

Taken together, these proposals could result in a reduction in cleaning standards in school and other buildings, and potentially less frequent cleaning. Given the scale of the savings, the proposal would also potentially result in significant staffing reductions to achieve the saving.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.090	5
2016/17	0.090	5
	0.400	tbc
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.580	tbc

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Potential negative impact on action 3 (economy): "The Council will prioritise and protect frontline staff, to maintain standards of service delivery and provide stability to the Highland economy. We will do all we can to avoid compulsory redundancies."

Deliverability and Risks

- A significant saving which will require a major review and change programme to deliver the saving.
- Equality impact – predominantly female and lower paid staff impacted by the saving

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

37% of Panel respondents reported that the proposal **would make no difference** to them or that it was **a change that could be coped with** (27%). 39% of the Panel believed that the proposal was **a change that could be coped with** by the wider community and a further 29% that it **may be a helpful change** or **a change for the better**.

Communities Panel – community groups

40% of groups reported that the proposal **would make no difference** to their group. Parent Councils were more likely to indicate that this **could cause some difficulty** to their group. Just over half of groups noted that it was **a change that could be coped with** by the wider community.

Website survey – others choosing to respond

Those responding to the web survey were divided on the potential impact of this proposal both on them individually and to the wider community.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Staff impacts

A number of the savings proposals presented include the restructure of teams and changes to working practices. Any deletion of posts will be undertaken in line with the Council's policies and procedures and will include the usual consultation processes with trade unions and staff. Steps will be taken to monitor the impact of staffing changes while maintaining a focus on promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination for our workforce.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required)

No impact

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Catering		
Savings Name	Catering		
Budget	£5.5m (Income budget)	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/24

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Increase school meal prices over the next 4 years by an additional 10p per meal per annum over and above inflation. These increases would be in addition to the annual inflationary increase applied corporately by the Council to fees and charges. Subject to the levels of inflation, the annual increase in school meals could be in the region of 8% p.a.

The current charges for meals are as shown below.

	Primary	Secondary
Current	£1.95	£2.15

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.142	
2016/17	0.138	
2017/18	0.135	
2018/19	0.131	
Aggregate	0.546	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

- Loss of business (reduced uptake of meals as a result)
- Pupils encouraged to seek cheaper alternatives off site/school premises
- Affordability for families
- Reduced uptake ; reduced staff morale
- Link to other saving proposals which could see this increase in charges introduced at a time when service provision /quality standards are reduced.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – free school meal allowance

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	School Lets		
Savings Name	School Lets		
Budget (£m)	£0.264m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/27

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

As reported to the August 2014 Education, Children and Adult Services Committee, the review of school lets has highlighted that additional income could be generated from more consistent application of the existing 2009 school lets policy.

Inconsistency of practice has led to situations where some individuals/groups letting schools are not being charged in line with policy, or in line with the charges applied in other schools.

Improved communication of the policy, and more consistent application of the existing policy, will ensure more equitable charging arrangements, and is also estimated to introduce some additional income as a result.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.020	
2016/17	0.020	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.040	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact.

Deliverability and Risks

Improved communication and training will be required to ensure consistency, as well as ongoing monitoring and review.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	School Lets		
Savings Name	Removal of free lets		
Budget (£m)	£0.264m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/28

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

As reported to the August 2014 Education, Children and Adult Services Committee, the review of school lets has highlighted the opportunity for introducing a more transparent and equitable approach to school lets, and generation of additional income, through review of existing policy and removal of free lets.

The proposal would see the removal of free lets, and a review of policy in relation to how that policy was implemented. Through a review, consideration could be given to some exceptions within a revised policy, where there was a clear business case for doing so. Any exceptions would clearly reduce the scope of additional income to be generated.

The proposal will see an increased cost to some users of facilities, but in doing so the process would be more transparent and equitable, and would place the school let function on a more stable and sustainable financial basis going forward.

The proposal is introduced as a 2016/17 saving, to give time for review and implementation of a new policy, and time for users to adapt to a new charging regime.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.150	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.150	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Empower our communities 12: The Council will ensure that all new school buildings will act as a community-hub. We will investigate new and innovative ways to deliver more community access to existing buildings as part of a review of the schools estate.

The introduction of greater charges could have a negative impact on use of school facilities, though the intention would be to structure the policy so as to avoid this position.

Deliverability and Risks

The phasing of the saving is so that there is sufficient time for discussion and agreement of a new policy approach, and for users to be aware of changes.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) (<i>link to full EQIA on web if necessary</i>)	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>)	

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	PPP Schools		
Savings Name	(PPP 1 & 2)		
Budget (£m)	£25.7m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference **C&L/29&30**

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

It is proposed to undertake a review of the existing schools PPP contracts (PPP1 and PPP2 contracts) to identify scope for savings. Savings may be possible from a number of actions, including; (1) a review of the service specification to make savings which may include reducing the scope of certain services provided such as facilities management, (2) review of the duration of contract and consideration of scope for extending the contract to a timescale comparable with that which the Council would finance its own schools over, thereby creating annual savings, (3) consideration of potential buy-out of the PPP contracts to achieve net savings.

All options would require further detailed consideration, with specialist input from financial, legal and other advisors. Discussions with the PPP providers and their funders would be required, and a willingness to explore and consider options on the part of the provider would be essential to delivery of any savings.

Under many of the scenarios outlined above, in particular (3) buyout (re-financing) and (2) contract extension, the objective would be for no or negligible impact at school level and on school users. Option (1) could see some reduction in the level of service or changes in how they are delivered.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.850	
2016/17	0.850	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	1.700	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact. The proposal is primarily considering options which would change the financing, contract duration or management arrangements for the PPP contract, which should have no or negligible impact on the school, user and Council programme.

Deliverability and Risks

This is a particularly challenging saving to deliver, given the complex nature of PPP contracts and the need for extensive expert (financial and legal) input to support reviewing options and implementation arrangements. Third party interests and agreement will also be critical to the proposal, including Scottish Government and Audit Scotland input, and most important of all a willingness on the part of the PPP providers and their funders to engage in dialogue, work with the Council on options, and agree to any changes the Council would wish to progress.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) (<i>link to full EQIA on web if necessary</i>) No impact - Internal efficiencies.	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) No impact - Internal efficiencies	

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Learning and Teaching		
Savings Name	Learning and Teaching		
Budget (£m)	0.420	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/31

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Remove Curriculum Development Secondments that have been in place to support implementation of curriculum for excellence and national qualifications. These staff will return to substantive posts.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.315	
2016/17	0.105	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.420	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Possible impact regarding Children & Young People: 2.5 – to deliver the experiences and learning outcomes of the Curriculum for Excellence; 2.6 – to maintain and build high educational standards.

Deliverability and Risks

None

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Learning and Teaching		
Savings Name	Training Budget		
Budget (£m)	£0.042m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/32

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Cut the funding available for learning and teaching training.

Reduced provision of training. Greater use of online learning and tele/video conference rather than centrally held training sessions.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.020	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.020	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Less leadership capacity in the teaching force.

Deliverability and Risks

No issues on deliverability. Risks - minor

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact - Internal management

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Quality Improvement Officers		
Savings Name	Quality Improvement Officers		
Budget (£m)	£0.669m	Staffing (FTE)	10

Reference C&L/33

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Two Quality Improvement Officer posts will be deleted from the team of 8 School QIOs.

This will reduce capacity for quality improvement and curriculum development. It will reduce the support given to schools for self-evaluation, and for preparing and responding to inspections.

It is intended to deploy the QIOs at an area level, to focus the remaining capacity on support for schools, while still maintaining strategic remits of impact

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.120	2.0
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.120	2.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Reduced capacity regarding Children & Young People: 2.5 – to deliver the experiences and learning outcomes of the Curriculum for Excellence; 2.6 – to maintain and build high educational standards; 2.13 – to support teachers in their efforts to raise attainment in literacy and numeracy.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability – No issues
Risks - None

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No impact on users – management issue.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Secondary Education		
Savings Name	Over Entitlement Teaching Posts		
Budget (£m)	£0.800m	Staffing (FTE)	1,254

Reference C&L/34

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

To remove the over staffing in some secondary schools. Historically a number of schools have had teachers in post which exceed their budget formula entitlement. Typically this may have been due to a falling school roll or specific arrangement which had been agreed over time. These over-entitlement posts would be removed from August 2015. This will be difficult for the schools because these posts have been in these schools for a number of years and they have built their curriculum with these staff included. Therefore these schools will have to reduce their curriculum delivery.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.520	13
2016/17	0.280	7
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.800	20

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability – Yes

The cumulative effect of some of the other savings and falling school rolls may make this more difficult to achieve in some schools.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – enforcing staffing formula.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact – same in all areas

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	School Contingency & Centrally Held Budgets		
Savings Name	School Contingency & Centrally Held Budgets		
Budget (£m)	£0.900m	Staffing (FTE)	Not applicable

Reference C&L/36-38

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

There are a number of centrally held budgets and contingency sums which are used to provide top-ups to school budgets. It is proposed to reduce or in some cases remove these budgets, therefore providing no top-up and requiring schools to instead manage within their devolved school management budgets.

The budgets which will be removed or reduced, and the implications are as follows:

- (1) Deficit School Top ups – where a school is in a deficit position, any deficit over and above that allowed within the parameters of the schools DSM scheme (currently 3%) is funded centrally by a top-up. It is proposed to remove this top-up budget in its entirety. As a result, schools would not be allowed to exceed the allowable deficit and Head Teachers would be expected to, and supported in, taking appropriate action to address the situation.
- (2) Centrally held staffing and other budgets – a central budget is held to provide additional staffing budget to schools where a specific top-up is required, for example, to provide additional management or other teaching support in exceptional cases. This budget will be reduced by 40%, leaving funding only for legal obligations such as covering staff maternity cover.

The impact of these proposals is that schools will have significantly reduced scope for a top-up from central funds. This will require schools to live within the devolved school management budget allocations without central top-up. Schools and Head Teachers may have to take action to reduce spending and/or reduce staffing, and any other actions necessary, to ensure they avoid going into deficit or requiring a top-up.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.625	Nil
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.625	Nil

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Overall this would reduce the level of budget made available to schools. In situations where schools could not manage within their devolved school budget, in the absence of these central top-up budgets, Head Teachers would have to consider steps to reduce spending within their school. Such actions could potentially negatively impact on certain programme priorities, though the objective would be to avoid such scenarios arising.

Deliverability and Risks

The removal of these central budgets will put even greater emphasis on the need for Head Teachers to manage within their devolved school management budgets. Head Teachers would require support in taking appropriate management action, including limiting spending and making staff changes where appropriate, to ensure they can remain within budget. The main challenges around deliverability and risks are ensuring that appropriate monitoring arrangements are in place so that budget issues can be identified at the earliest opportunity, and Head Teachers able to take management action as necessary.

Consultation feedback	
Summary	
NA	
Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) (<i>link to full EQIA on web if necessary</i>)	
No equality impact – the proposal is about the efficient running of the service.	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>)	
No impact	

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Nursery Staffing		
Savings Name	Nursery Staffing		
Budget (£m)	£0.200m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/39

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

It's proposed to remove the contingency budget for nursery teaching staffing, to fund cover for staff sickness and vacancies etc. This represents the complete removal of this budget.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.200	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.200	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Overall this would reduce the level of budget made available to schools. In the absence of these central top-up budgets, Head Teachers would have to consider steps to reduce spending within their school. Such actions could potentially negatively impact on certain programme priorities, though the objective would be to avoid such scenarios arising.

Deliverability and Risks

The removal of these central budgets will put even greater emphasis on the need for Head Teachers to manage within their budgets. Head Teachers would require support in taking appropriate management action, including limiting spending and making staff changes where appropriate, to ensure they can remain within budget. The main challenges around deliverability and risks are ensuring that appropriate monitoring arrangements are in place so that budget issues can be identified at the earliest opportunity, and Head Teachers able to take management action as necessary.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – this is about efficient budget management.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact – this is about efficient budget management.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Secondary Education		
Savings Name	33 Period Week		
Budget (£m)	£64.0m	Staffing (FTE)	1,254

Reference C&L/41

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This proposal to introduce a standard timetabling structure across Highland secondary schools, based on 33 periods, which is the optimal staffing and timetabling model.

This approach will allow greater collaboration opportunities across schools. It will also allow schools to maximise the use of staff time. Some schools already operate this model; it will require other schools to reorganise their timetables and the structure of their day.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.150	3.7
2016/17	0.075	1.9
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.225	5.6

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability – Yes

Risks – This may incur additional transport costs due to the reorganisation of transport contracts and fitting in with public services timetables.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – more efficient use of resources

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Potential positive impact for rural schools

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Secondary Education		
Savings Name	1% cut in Secondary Staffing		
Budget (£m)	£60.0m	Staffing (FTE)	1,254

Reference C&L/42

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This will involve a 1% reduction in budgets for staff allocation in secondary schools. This will require changes to subject choice and class sizes across the secondary curriculum.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.400	10
2016/17	0.200	5
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.600	15

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Possible impact regarding Children & Young People: 2.5 – to deliver the experiences and learning outcomes of the Curriculum for Excellence; 2.6 – to maintain and build high educational standards.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability – Yes

Risks – The cumulative effect of this with the other staffing savings may make this more difficult. Parents and children may be unhappy with less choice in their local school.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

44% of the Panel indicated that the proposal **would make no difference** to them or their family however just under a third felt it **could cause some difficulty**. 53% of respondents reported that the proposal **could cause some difficulty** for the wider community. Respondents with school aged children were more likely to indicate this **could cause some difficulty** for them and the wider community.

The survey also asked about the potential impact of reducing secondary staffing by a further 1%. Whilst the impact upon individuals was similar to the original proposal, 73% of respondents indicated that this **could cause some difficulty** to the wider community.

Communities Panel – community groups

Groups were divided on the impact this proposal would have on their groups with 40 indicating it **would make no difference** but 38% that it **could cause some difficulty**. Two thirds of groups however reported that this **could cause some difficulty** for the wider community. Parent Councils were more likely to indicate that this proposal **could cause some difficulty** for their group.

The survey also asked about the potential impact of reducing secondary staffing by a further 1%. Over half of respondents indicated that this additional reduction **could cause some difficulty** to their group (52%) and to the wider community (83%).

Website survey – others choosing to respond

Over half of respondents reported that this proposal **could cause some difficulty** for them (54%) or the wider community (67%). Families with school aged children were more likely to indicate that this **could cause some difficulty**.

The survey also asked about the potential impact of reducing secondary staffing by a further 1%. The majority of respondents indicated that this additional reduction **could cause some difficulty** to them (64%) and to the wider community (80%).

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*) ([link to full EQIA on web if necessary](#))

Staff Impact

A number of the savings proposals presented include the restructure of teams and changes to working practices. Any deletion of posts will be undertaken in line with the Council's policies and procedures and will include the usual consultation processes with trade unions and staff. Steps will be taken to monitor the impact of staffing changes while maintaining a focus on promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination for our workforce.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

Need to ensure no adverse impact on schools

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Secondary Education		
Savings Name	Use of more technology to deliver the curriculum		
Budget (£m)	£60.0m	Staffing (FTE)	1,254

Reference C&L/43

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Use of more technology to deliver courses in schools. This could result in less staff being required in schools.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.400	10.0
2017/18	0.200	5.0
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.600	15

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability – This should be deliverable assuming there are no barriers to the new technology available.

Risks – The size of the savings are ambitious, and will require timetable reorganisation, optimum use of technology and significant course development.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

47% of Panel respondents reported that the introduction of distance learning **would make no difference** to them or their family. Over half of respondents (63%) indicated that it **may be a helpful change** or **a change for the better** for the wider community.

Communities Panel – community groups

42% of groups reported that this proposal **would make no difference** to their group. Groups were divided upon the impact on the wider community with 41% reporting that it **may be a helpful change** or **a change for the better** but a further 39% that it **could cause some difficulty**. Parent Councils were more likely to indicate that this **could cause some difficulty** for their group and the wider community.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

Respondents were divided on the impact of the proposal on them and their family and also the wider community. When considering the wider community, 38% indicated that it **could cause some difficulty** but a further 36% that it **may be a helpful change or a change for the better**.

Equalities

Some concerns were expressed by the Deaf Forum about the implementation of this and the need to ensure the needs of pupils with hearing impairments were taken into account.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

This may impact on some pupils but should be mitigated by ensuring that all pupils are enabled/supported to participate

Staff Impact

A number of the savings proposals presented include the restructure of teams and changes to working practices. Any deletion of posts will be undertaken in line with the Council's policies and procedures and will include the usual consultation processes with trade unions and staff. Steps will be taken to monitor the impact of staffing changes while maintaining a focus on promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination for our workforce.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

The impact is likely to be positive for rural schools. Some schools are already using technology to deliver courses (Lochaber).

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Reference	C&L/45A
Activity Heading	Highlife Highland				
Savings Name	Highlife Highland				
Budget (£m)	£14.2m	Staffing (FTE)	Nil (not HC staff)		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

High Life Highland (HLH) is a charitable company established by the Council in 2011 to deliver a range of activities, services and facilities previously provided by the Council including public libraries, archives, adult education, youth work, sports, arts, museums and galleries, leisure and community centres.

The proposal involves a 4% reduction in funding for HLH in 2015/16 and a 1% reduction in the following three financial years. It is for the HLH Board to determine how this would be achieved via a combination of service changes, service reductions and additional income. It is envisaged that a reduction in Council support is likely to have some impact on the on the level of services, activities and facilities provided by the organisation. However, it is anticipated that the phasing of budget reductions over an agreed number of years would give the organisation some time to plan and implement efficiency measures to achieve the required savings targets and to minimise potential impacts on front line service delivery. In addition, the organisation has some potential for increased income generation by increasing charges for services.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.560	
2016/17	0.140	
2017/18	0.140	
2018/19	0.140	
Aggregate	0.980	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There may be some impact on Programme commitments 2.21 to encourage activities for children beyond the school day; 2.22 to expand access to culture and the arts; 6.7 to support volunteering and community development; 6.8 to encourage community empowerment; 6.15 to widen access to language tuition, support adult basic education and deliver innovative library services

Deliverability and Risks

It is anticipated that the proposal is deliverable. Phasing the reduction in Council funding over 4 years would give the organisation some time to implement efficiencies and potentially increase income in the short to medium term.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

39% of Panel respondents indicated that the proposal to reduce funding to High Life Highland, Inverness Leisure and Eden Court would **cause some difficulty** for them (39%) and for the wider community (53%). Those with school aged children were more likely to indicate this **could cause some difficult** than those without.

When asked about an additional reduction in funding for High Life Highland and Inverness Leisure, the majority of Panel respondents indicated this could cause some difficulty for them (51%) and for the wider community (69%).

Panel members were divided on the impact of a further reduction in funding to Eden Court to them as individuals. 37% reported this could **cause some difficulty** to the wider community but a further 36% that it was a **change that could be coped with**.

Communities Panel – community groups

Groups indicated that the proposal to reduce funding to High Life Highland, Inverness Leisure and Eden Court would **cause some difficulty** for their group (43%) and for the wider community (59%).

When asked about an additional reduction in funding for High Life Highland and Inverness Leisure, the majority of groups indicated this could cause some difficulty for their group (61%) and for the wider community (74%).

Groups were divided on the impact of a further reduction in funding to Eden Court to their organisation. 40% reported this could **cause some difficulty** to the wider community but a further 35% that it was a **change that could be coped with**.

The *Highland Third Sector Interface* expressed specific concern about the reduction of funding to High Life Highland and Eden Court. Inverness Leisure and Eden Court provided submissions to the consultation. These are summarised in the main consultation feedback.

Website survey – others choosing to respond

The majority of respondents reported that the proposal to reduce funding to High Life Highland, Inverness Leisure and Eden Court **could cause some difficulty** for them (58%) and the wider community (66%).

When asked about an additional reduction in funding for High Life Highland and Inverness Leisure, the majority of respondents indicated this could cause some difficulty for them (67%) and for the wider community (77%).

Panel members were divided on the impact of a further reduction in funding to Eden Court to them as individuals. 41% reported this could **cause some difficulty** to the wider community but a further 32% that it was a **change that could be coped with**.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*) (*link to full EQIA on web if necessary*)

Potential negative impact but need to seek reassurance from HLH that any saving will not disadvantage particular groups. HLH EQIA recommended.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

Potential negative impact, need reassurance from HLH that rural areas won't be disadvantaged

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Reference	C&L/45B
Activity Heading	Inverness Leisure				
Savings Name	Inverness Leisure				
Budget (£m)	£0.860m	Staffing (FTE)	Nil (not HC staff)		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Inverness Leisure is a charitable organisation providing public swimming, swimming lessons and access to a significant range of sporting recreational and leisure opportunities for residents and visitors to the city and the Highlands.

The proposal is to reduce funding by 4% in 2015/16 with a reduction of 1% in the following three financial years. It is for the Board/Trustees of the organisations to determine how this will be achieved via a combination of service changes, service reductions and additional income. It is envisaged that the reduction in Council support is likely to have some impact on the on the level of services, activities and facilities provided by the organisation. It is anticipated, however, that the phasing of budget reductions over an agreed number of years would give the organisation some time to plan and implement efficiency measures to achieve the required savings targets and to minimise potential impacts on front line service delivery. In addition, the organisation has some potential for increased income generation by increasing charges for services.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.034	
2016/17	0.008	
2017/18	0.008	
2018/19	0.008	
Aggregate	0.058	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There may be some impact on Programme commitments 6.7 to support volunteering and community development; 6.8 to encourage community empowerment

Deliverability and Risks

It is anticipated that the proposal is deliverable. Phasing the reduction in Council funding over 4 years would give the organisation some time to implement efficiencies and potentially increase income in the short to medium term.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

39% of Panel respondents indicated that the proposal to reduce funding to High Life Highland, Inverness Leisure and Eden Court would **cause some difficulty** for them (39%) and for the wider community (53%). Those with school aged children were more likely to indicate this **could cause some difficult** than those without.

When asked about an additional reduction in funding for High Life Highland and Inverness Leisure, the majority of Panel respondents indicated this could cause some difficulty for them (51%) and for the wider community (69%).

Panel members were divided on the impact of a further reduction in funding to Eden Court to them as individuals.

37% reported this could **cause some difficulty** to the wider community but a further 36% that it was a **change that could be coped with**.

Communities Panel – community groups

Groups indicated that the proposal to reduce funding to High Life Highland, Inverness Leisure and Eden Court would **cause some difficulty** for their group (43%) and for the wider community (59%).

When asked about an additional reduction in funding for High Life Highland and Inverness Leisure, the majority of groups indicated this could cause some difficulty for their group (61%) and for the wider community (74%).

Groups were divided on the impact of a further reduction in funding to Eden Court to their organisation. 40% reported this could **cause some difficulty** to the wider community but a further 35% that it was a **change that could be coped with**.

The *Highland Third Sector Interface* expressed specific concern about the reduction of funding to High Life Highland and Eden Court. Inverness Leisure and Eden Court provided submissions to the consultation. These are summarised in the main consultation feedback.

Website survey – others choosing to respond

The majority of respondents reported that the proposal to reduce funding to High Life Highland, Inverness Leisure and Eden Court **could cause some difficulty** for them (58%) and the wider community (66%).

When asked about an additional reduction in funding for High Life Highland and Inverness Leisure, the majority of respondents indicated this could cause some difficulty for them (67%) and for the wider community (77%).

Panel members were divided on the impact of a further reduction in funding to Eden Court to them as individuals. 41% reported this could **cause some difficulty** to the wider community but a further 32% that it was a **change that could be coped with**.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*) (*link to full EQIA on web if necessary*)

Potential negative impact but need to seek reassurance from Inverness Leisure that the proposal will not disproportionately affect any equality group

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

Potential negative impact, need reassurance from Inverness Leisure that rural areas won't be disproportionately disadvantaged.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Reference	C&L/45C
Activity Heading	Eden Court				
Savings Name	Eden Court				
Budget (£m)	£0.625	Staffing (FTE)	Nil (not HC staff)		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Eden Court provides an extensive arts programme that includes classical and traditional music, jazz, drama, dance, film, comedy and opera, a significant range of creative arts classes and outreach community arts programme and delivers SQA dance and drama courses.

The proposal is to reduce funding for the organisation by 4% in 2015/16 with a reduction of 1% in the following three financial years. It is for the Board of Eden Court to determine how this will be achieved through, for example, service changes, service reductions or additional income generation. It is envisaged that reduction in Council support is likely to have some impact on the on the level of services, activities and facilities provided by the organisation. It is anticipated, however, that the phasing of budget reductions over an agreed period of time would give both organisations some time to plan and implement efficiency measures to achieve the required savings targets and to minimise potential impacts on front line service delivery. In addition, the organisation has some potential for increased income generation by increasing charges for services.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.025	
2016/17	0.005	
2017/18	0.005	
2018/19	0.005	
Aggregate	0.040	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There may be some impact on Programme commitments 2.22 to expand access to culture and the arts; 6.7 to support volunteering and community development; 6.8 to encourage community empowerment

Deliverability and Risks

It is anticipated that the proposal is deliverable. Phasing the reduction in Council funding over 4 years would give the organisation some time to implement efficiencies and potentially increase income in the short to medium term.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

39% of Panel respondents indicated that the proposal to reduce funding to High Life Highland, Inverness Leisure and Eden Court would **cause some difficulty** for them (39%) and for the wider community (53%). Those with school aged children were more likely to indicate this **could cause some difficult** than those without.

When asked about an additional reduction in funding for High Life Highland and Inverness Leisure, the majority of Panel respondents indicated this could cause some difficulty for them (51%) and for the wider community (69%).

Panel members were divided on the impact of a further reduction in funding to Eden Court to them as individuals. 37% reported this could **cause some difficulty** to the wider community but a further 36% that it was a **change that could be coped with**.

Communities Panel – community groups

Groups indicated that the proposal to reduce funding to High Life Highland, Inverness Leisure and Eden Court would **cause some difficulty** for their group (43%) and for the wider community (59%).

When asked about an additional reduction in funding for High Life Highland and Inverness Leisure, the majority of groups indicated this could cause some difficulty for their group (61%) and for the wider community (74%).

Groups were divided on the impact of a further reduction in funding to Eden Court to their organisation. 40% reported this could **cause some difficulty** to the wider community but a further 35% that it was a **change that could be coped with**.

The *Highland Third Sector Interface* expressed specific concern about the reduction of funding to High Life Highland and Eden Court. Inverness Leisure and Eden Court provided submissions to the consultation. These are summarised in the main consultation feedback.

Website survey – others choosing to respond

The majority of respondents reported that the proposal to reduce funding to High Life Highland, Inverness Leisure and Eden Court **could cause some difficulty** for them (58%) and the wider community (66%).

When asked about an additional reduction in funding for High Life Highland and Inverness Leisure, the majority of respondents indicated this could cause some difficulty for them (67%) and for the wider community (77%).

Panel members were divided on the impact of a further reduction in funding to Eden Court to them as individuals. 41% reported this could **cause some difficulty** to the wider community but a further 32% that it was a **change that could be coped with**.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*) (*link to full EQIA on web if necessary*)

Potential negative impact but need to seek reassurance from both organisations that the proposal will not disproportionately affect any equality group

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

Potential negative impact, need reassurance from both organisations that rural areas won't be disproportionately disadvantaged.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Management of Secondary School Facilities		
Savings Name	Management of Secondary School Facilities by Highlife Highland		
Budget (£m)	£0.100m	Staffing (FTE)	Nil

Reference C&L/47

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The Education, Children and Adult Services Committee, in August 2014, agreed to the principle of Highlife Highland (HLH) taking on management of secondary school facilities. The rationale being that this model can provide opportunities for more efficient management of community facilities, utilise HLH expertise in marketing and managing facilities, and lead to improved use of facilities and income generation.

It is expected that through this model, costs to HLH of managing facilities can be offset through additional income generated. As a result historic Council budgets for staff overtime and other costs associated with this function, can be offered as a saving.

There is no negative impact in terms of service delivery. It is considered the proposal provides an opportunity to enhance service delivery, and see greater use of community facilities.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.017	
2016/17	0.025	
2017/18	0.025	
2018/19	0.025	
Aggregate	0.092	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact.

Deliverability and Risks

The model will be considered and rolled out on a case by case basis. Arrangements are being discussed with HLH and certain schools. The exact working arrangements, costs and incomes, will be subject to review and negotiation with HLH.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact on end users, the proposal related only to the management of facilities

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	3rd party grants and payments		
Savings Name	3rd party grants and payments		
Budget (£m)	£1.272m	Staffing (FTE)	Nil (not HC staff)

Reference **C&L/48**

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The Council provides support for a number of 3rd party organisations that offer a range of services and facilities in communities. This includes arts and cultural groups, independent museums, sport and leisure centres, village and community halls and organisations that provide youth and adult education activities and programmes. The proposal is to reduce the budget for 3rd party grant and payments by 50%, to cease all current funding arrangements, to undertake a major policy review and to establish a new fund into which organisations could bid for support in future.

This would be undertaken in two stages.

48: Phase 1 – 5% reduction in all current grants and payments to 3rd party organisations in 2016/17. A list of the organisations currently receiving support is provided in the **Appendix**.

49: Phase 2 – Major review of policy and budget for 3rd parties (with the exception of those organisations addressed through separate savings proposals – Highlife Highland, Eden Court & Inverness Leisure). A further reduction of 45% in the budget for 3rd parties and the cessation of all current funding arrangements. The introduction of a new fund (50% less than the current budget) with a new application and bidding process based on criteria to be established. The new reduced fund would be open to applications from groups that are currently supported as well as to those that do not currently receive funding. The new fund arrangements would be in place for the 2017/18 financial year.

Phase 1 may result in the closure of some facilities or cessation of some services. Phase 2 will result in the closure of facilities and cessation of services provided by those organisations that currently receive support if they are not successful in the new bidding process. Phase 2, however, would also potentially open up new opportunities for groups that do not receive funding at present and introduce greater equity in accessing Council financial support.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.063	
2017/18	0.573	
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.636	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There will be some impact on Programme commitments 2.22 to expand access to culture and the arts; 6.7 to support volunteering and community development; 6.8 to encourage community empowerment; 6.15 to widen access to language tuition, support adult basic education and deliver innovative library services

Deliverability and Risks

The lead in time for the full implementation of the proposal is fairly short in terms of establishing the criteria, processes, governance etc. for a new Fund. Funding decisions would need to be made by autumn 2016 at the latest so that groups that applied to the new Fund knew whether or not they would receive Council support from the 2017/18 financial year. The timescale is equally important for successful and unsuccessful applicants. Successful

applicants would be aware of the basis of new funding arrangements with the Council giving them time to plan for the future. Unsuccessful applicants (particularly those who currently receive Council support) would have to implement very significant organisational changes ranging from potential service reductions to redeployment or redundancy of staff to closure of facilities etc.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

The Panel were divided upon the potential impact of this proposal on them and their family however half of the Panel indicated that it **could cause some difficulty** to the wider community. Individuals with children were more likely to indicate that this proposal **could cause some difficulty**.

Communities Panel – community groups

The majority of the Community Panel reported that this proposal **could cause some difficulty** to their group (54%) and also to the wider community (70%). The *Highland Third Sector Interface* noted particular concern from their Members around this proposal. Submissions detailing individual impact were also received from organisations affected. Details of this can be found in the full consultation analysis.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

The majority of respondents reported that the proposal **could cause some difficulty** for them (52%) and for the wider community (66%).

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

A 10% reduction over two years is unlikely to have significant equality or rural impact, although it is noted that museums have already had an 18% cut over last two years and other organisations have had standstill budgets.

Phase 2 This will lead to an accumulative 50% less funding to bid into. This is likely to lead to closures of some organisations and therefore a potential rural impact. Funded organisations are heavily supported by volunteers, predominantly older people. For example, museum staff - 21 FTE – only one male, so a potential impact upon gender. (whole museum sector approx. 120 staff). Examples of services that are likely to be at high risk of closure include Independent swimming pools and leisure centres. For example Poolewe Swimming Pool has around 5,500 users. Serves Gairloch and Poolewe. The nearest alternative is Ullapool. Most of the affected organisations rely heavily on volunteers. Museums being supported by predominantly older people, so a potential negative impact on age. A potential positive impact might be that reapplication for all could mean opening up to other groups that have no current access, albeit to a smaller fund. A full EQIA will be carried out as part of the review.

http://www.highland.gov.uk/downloads/download/404/equality_impact_assessments

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required)

Potential rural impact on 3rd sector services and local community groups

Savings Proposals 48 & 49

Appendix

Organisation	Purpose
Community Centres	
Nairn Community & Arts Centre	Revenue support for community facility run by a community group.
Duthac Centre	Revenue support for community organisation providing community facilities in Tain
Arts & Culture	
AROS	Support for provision of cultural and arts programme in Skye
Highland Print Studio	Programme and revenue support
Lochaber Music School	Programme and revenue support to organisation providing music tuition in Lochaber
Lyth Arts Centre	Programme and revenue support for arts centre in Caithness
Room 13	Programme and revenue support for art initiative for primary aged children in Lochaber
Society of Badenoch & Strathspey Artists	To enable community group operate council owned Iona Gallery in Kingussie
Touring Network	Revenue support for Highland co-ordinating network of local arts promoters
Strathpeffer Pavilion	Programme and revenue support for facility providing arts and cultural activities in Strathpeffer
Sport & Leisure	
Assynt Leisure	Revenue support for community group providing sport/leisure activities and services in NW Sutherland
Linnhe Leisure (Nevis Centre)	Revenue support for organisation providing sport/leisure/community services in Fort William area
Lochalsh Leisure Centre	Revenue support for community group providing sport/leisure facilities including swimming in Lochalsh and Skye
Mallaig & District Swimming Pool Association	Revenue support for community organisation providing sport/leisure facilities and services in Mallaig area
Nairn Sports Club	Up keep of tennis court and provision of public access to tennis courts in Nairn
North Coast Leisure (Bettyhill Pool)	Revenue support for community group providing sport/leisure facilities and services in North Sutherland
Poolewe Swimming Pool	Revenue support for community group operating swimming pool in Poolewe area
Puffin Pool (Dingwall)	Revenue support to enable public access to hydrotherapy facilities in Dingwall area
Camachd Association	Contribution to sports development officer post
Highland Curling Development Group	Programme support for curling
Highland Disability Sport	Revenue support for organisation
Museums & Heritage	
Ardnamurchan Lighthouse Trust	Revenue support for museum/heritage facility and activities in Ardnamurchan area
Caithness Horizons	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Thurso area
Cromarty Courthouse	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Cromarty area

Dingwall Museum	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Dingwall area
Dornoch History Links	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Dornoch area
Dunbeath Preservation Trust	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Dunbeath area
Gairloch Museum	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Gairloch area
Glencoe & Lorne Folk Museum	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Glencoe area
Glenfinnan Station Museum	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Glenfinnan area
Grantown Museum & Heritage Trust	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Grantown area
Groam House Museum	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Rosemarkie & Fortrose area
Highland Museum of Childhood	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Strathpeffer area
Mallaig Heritage Centre	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Mallaig area
Nairn Museum	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Nairn area
Strathnaver Museum	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Strathnaver area
Tain Through Time	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Tain area
Tarbat Historic Trust	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Portmahomack area
Timespan Museum	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Helmsdale area
Ullapool Museum	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Ullapool area
West Highland Museum	Revenue support for community group providing museum/heritage facility and activities in Fort William area
Youth Work	
Thurso Youth Club	Revenue/programme support for youth work activities in Thurso
Grantown YMCA	Revenue/programme support for youth work activities in Grantown
Wick Youth Club	Revenue/programme support for youth work activities in Wick
Youth Highland	Revenue/programme support for youth activities in Highland
Highland Division Girls Brigade	Volunteer training/revenue support to enable organisation provide youth activities
Highland Battalion Boys Brigade	Volunteer training/revenue support to enable organisation provide youth activities
Girlguiding - Inverness-shire, Ross-shire, Sutherland & Caithness	Volunteer training/revenue support to enable organisation provide youth activities
Highlands & Islands Regional Scout Council	Volunteer training/revenue support to enable organisation provide youth activities
Inverness Sea Cadets	Volunteer training/revenue support to enable organisation provide youth activities
Adult Learning	
LEAD	Support for programme for adult learners with disabilities
WEA	Support for liberal studies and creative arts programme
Grant Schemes	
Village Hall Grants	Revenue grants for village halls up to £1k per hall. Halls apply on annual basis

Local Arts Promoters Scheme	Grants scheme for local programmes of arts events. Annual application
Sports Councils	Payment to 8 sports councils to administer scheme of local sports grants on Council's behalf
Sutherland Youth Grants	Scheme of grants for youth work in Sutherland. Annual application

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Area Management Structure		
Savings Name	Implementation of New Area Management Structure		
Budget (£m)	£1.9m	Staffing (FTE)	22

Reference C&L/50

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The Council has agreed a new area management structure for the Care and Learning Service. Dependent on the outcome of job evaluation, this will achieve savings of £0.075m.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.075	1
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.075	1

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Structure agreed by Committee, no risks to highlight.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact - Internal management

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact - Internal management

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Conserved Teachers Salaries		
Savings Name	Conserved Teachers Salaries		
Budget (£m)	£0.200m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/51

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Across Scotland, as part of the McCrone teaching staffing agreement, there has been an arrangement in place to conserve the salary of certain teaching posts at promoted levels.

This national arrangement will come to an end in April 2016, and at that time, unless other arrangements or mitigations are put in place, those teachers affected would revert to the appropriate grade for the post they currently fill. As a result, there would be a saving to the Council, being the difference between the conserved salary, and the substantive post salary.

Staff affected are aware of the change agreed at a national level, and discussions will take place with them over coming months to explain the implications, and any options which may be available to them.

There are no direct implications for service delivery. The proposal does not alter the number of teaching posts.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.200	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.200	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

No issues, the proposal is implementation of teaching salary arrangements which have been agreed at a national level.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact – internal service issue

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact – internal service issue

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Resource Manager Youth Justice		
Savings Name	Resource Manager Youth Justice		
Budget (£m)	£1.615m	Staffing (FTE)	1
	Total Youth Action Service		

Reference C&L/52

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

It's proposed to delete the post of Resource Manager in the Youth Action Service.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.025	0.5
2016/17	0.025	0.5
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.050	1

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

The reduction would be achieved via a service review.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No direct front line impact

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Residential Social Workers		
Savings Name	Residential Social Workers		
Budget (£m)	£2.770m for all residential child care	Staffing (FTE)	2 current RSW posts currently – 2 more were planned which the saving relates too.

Reference C&L/53

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

It had been planned to increase the number of qualified social workers employed in Highland children's homes, by regrading a small number of posts. Funding had been released for this purpose through service efficiencies. This would not go ahead.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.026	N/A
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.026	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

There are no identified risks or barriers to delivery.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact or change to the current service, not removing any provision just not enhancing as intended.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No impact or change to the current service, not removing any provision just not enhancing as intended.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	School rationalisations		
Savings Name	School rationalisations		
Budget (£m)	£114m (total Highland schools budget)	Staffing (FTE)	2,300

Reference C&L/54

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

It is proposed that the Council will undertake further reviews of school provision, identifying opportunities to improve educational provision, and reduce the number of individual schools through rationalisation.

Where proposals related to the closure or re-location of schools, these would be subject to statutory consultation and the Council would undertake that consultation in line with the relevant legislation.

Further preliminary work would take place to scope the potential schools and develop a programme of proposed rationalisations.

Some degree of investment from the existing capital programme may be required to implement any agreed changes.

Savings would derive from reduced staffing and building operational costs, offset to some extent by additional transport and other costs. The template reflects an estimated level of saving, the specifics of which would be determined by the specific proposals to be consulted on, and the timeline for taking rationalisations forward.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		Difficult to quantify at this stage
2016/17		
2017/18	0.500	
2018/19	0.350	
Aggregate	0.850	

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

As required by legislation, any proposed rationalisation would have to demonstrate the educational benefits, and therefore would be expected to have a positive impact in terms of education.

In terms of community impact, there could be negative impacts from the closure of rural schools – these issues would however be addressed and considered fully as part of the statutory consultation process.

Deliverability and Risks

All proposals would be subject to statutory consultation, decision and potential ministerial call-in, in line with the relevant legislation.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) (<i>link to full EQIA on web if necessary</i>)	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>)	

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Catering		
Savings Name	Food specification		
Budget (£m)	£4.6m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference C&L/55

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The school catering service in Scotland is governed by The Schools (Health Promotion and Nutritional) (Scotland) Act 2007, and must comply with this legislation in regards to specific food groups and portion sizes to meet the nutritional requirements.

The Catering Service over the last few years has strived to encourage local produce/producers and growers. The Council implemented the Sustainable Procurement Strategy for Food and Drink, and this endorsed working with and supporting local producers and growers - taking into account sustainability and the strategy for evaluation criteria within the Councils Food Tenders and specifications.

This saving is achieved by reducing the specification in relation to certain food groups, mainly in provenance and accreditation criteria. We would continue to purchase from local producers.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.123	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.123	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

- Actions 3 and 9 in Economy theme
- Procurement
- Reduction in use of certain local producers /growers
- End of Councils current Sustainable Procurement Strategy for Food and Drink

Deliverability and Risks

- Compliance with The Schools (Health Promotion and Nutritional) (Scotland) Act 2007
- Impact on menu choices and menu planning
- Customer satisfaction and confidence in provenance of foodstuffs
- Reduced specifications in certain food groups
- Reduction in quality of certain food groups
- Potential loss of business for local producers /growers
- Potential loss of customers

Consultation feedback

Summary

Citizens' Panel – representative views

55% of Panel respondents noted that this proposal **would make no difference** to them or their family. 37% reported that it **may be a helpful change** or **a change for the better** for the wider community and 33% noted that it was **a change that could be coped with**. Those with school aged children were more likely to say that it could **cause some difficulty** for them or their family.

Communities Panel – community groups

46% of groups noted that the proposal **would make no difference** to them and 43% that it was a **change that could be coped with** by the wider community. Parent Councils were more likely to indicate that the proposal **could cause some difficulty** to their group.

Website Survey – others choosing to respond

Respondents were divided on the potential impact of this proposal on them but also on the wider community.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No equality impact

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required)

There is **potential for impact** on rural providers, but this is not anticipated.

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Care & Learning		
Activity Heading	Community Development / Health Improvement		
Savings Name	Joint Management of Community Development / Health Improvement		
Budget (£m)	N/A	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference BTT4

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

There are a range of staff across agencies involved in Community Development and Health Improvement, albeit largely based in NHS Highland (including with some THC funding). The Community Planning Partnership has recently agreed the need to better co-ordinate community development activity, and has established a Strategic Community Development Partnership – not including Health Improvement, which is still largely seen as an NHS Highland function. There is potential for cost savings, but this will require effective collaboration across partners on a scale not yet anticipated, and Highland Council is unlikely to benefit much in terms of direct savings. While this is also some way off, the Strategic Partnership should establish the foundations to achieve benefits in the future.

Work needed to assess years 3 and 4 – possibly circa £50k.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19	0.050	
Aggregate	0.050	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

N/A

Deliverability and Risks

N/A

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Under development impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Under development impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Income Generation		
Savings Name	Income Generation through Catering		
Budget (£m)	£4.6m	Staffing (FTE)	363

Reference IG2

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Additional income from catering could be generated from:

- Vending machines for staff
- Trolley services for staff
- Selling sundry items in canteen
- Greater use of the facility to allow staff to pre-order lunch for training sessions
- Supply catering for weddings
- General outside catering for events
- Snack 'hut' at HQ (external snack bar)
- Establish a kitchen in the Members area to provide a higher level of meals to both Members and staff (this has been considered previously)
- Luncheon Clubs for the elderly in the schools.

It is thought that a change in policy with regards to always allowing Care And Learning Catering to quote for catering services would help to keep funds within the organisation. (Tender Recently Gone Out For Town House Catering)

Catering currently has to compete with external contractors for Council Business., or not have the opportunity to quote for Council events or services therefore keeping the income in-house. It is thought that private contractors often have a competitive advantage due to staff employment policy, lower quality of products and not having a policy of having to source locally. Business has been lost to others such as the catering for the Town House (est. £30k per annum) or due to budget cuts such as at training facilities at Dochfour Drive. Changes in staff terms and conditions of employment have increased overheads affecting competitiveness. The catering service continues to seek additional business within and externally, and has to increase income on yearly budgets which is more difficult year on year.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.052	Potential additional staff
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.052	tbc

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability – Demand and customer needs

Risks - Loss to council if not enough income/need, creating new jobs, capital investment in equipment. The Council may be seen to be taking business away from local catering & supplies companies.

Assumptions - the following assumptions for per annum income have been made to arrive at overall income figures above:

- Vending machines for staff- min £200 week annual income £10k, dependant on location (2 in each 5 main office locations) Total = £50k
- Trolley services for staff- £1k week annual £48k (HQ only)
- Selling sundry items in canteen £1k (HQ only)
- Greater use of the facility to allow staff to pre-order lunch for training sessions estimated as 10 staff per day at £2. Total = £5k.
- Work with to supply catering for weddings 4 weddings year £20k
- General outside catering for events 4 events £8k
- Snack 'hut' at HQ (external snack bar) as an alternative to some of the above ideas.
- Establish a kitchen in the Members area to provide a higher level of meals to both Members and staff (this has been considered previously) 30% of 600 employees at HQ x average £3 a day spend = £540 per day. Total = £126k per annum (this could always be used for visitors meetings break out and coffees snacks served all day)
- Luncheon Clubs for the elderly in the schools. £50 per club per day (10 attendees approx. £5 a head.) 10 events held. Total = £0.5k

A net income of 20% has been assumed on the above figures above giving £52k.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No equality impact

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required)

No equality impact

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Income Generation		
Savings Name	Charge for Local Advice Packs for Planning		
Budget (£m)	£2.953m	Staffing (FTE)	61

Reference IG4

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Introduce charge for local pre-application advice packs. For local development planning applications, we do not currently charge – we dealt with around 700 formal pre-application requests last year. Local authorities have discretion as to whether to charge for the delivery of such services, and this proposal would mirror a charging mechanism we use for major developments.

Investments required = £25k

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.045	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.045	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

This proposal will provide certainty to prospective developers as to the requirements of any subsequent planning application and thereby support the delivery of economic activity.

Deliverability and Risks

The deliverability of this savings proposal is dependent on customer acceptance of the charging mechanism.

Risks - Reputational damage is customers are put off by level of charges.

Environmental impact is people press ahead without pre-application advice – or risk of delay in planning process if additional information which would normally be sought at pre-app stage has to be requested.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact – there is no equality impact identified with this proposal.

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact – there is no rural impact identified with this proposal, there are no difference between charges in rural/urban areas.

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Income Generation		
Savings Name	Support for Council Renewables Projects		
Budget (£m)	N/A	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference IG10

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Support for Council Renewable Projects. Capital investment in wind farms and exploitation of methane gas from Longman landfill site to generate electricity.

This work is a key part of the delivery of the Council Carbon Management Plan, the project offers an opportunity to accelerate the carbon reduction towards the Carbon Clever programme and will bring in the concept of self-generation that will bring income and can potentially lead to reduced electricity costs from indigenous local generation.

The savings are net of capital financing costs.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.003	
2016/17	0.231	
2017/18	0.116	
2018/19	0.136	
Aggregate	0.486	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

This will help the carbon management plan to achieve the outcomes required by that policy.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability – The project relies on the availability of grid connections and planning consents, a range of options are being developed for the delivery and this will mitigate against limited connection allowance provision at sites

Risks - Planning consent and Environmental Impact analysis if required, the project is seeking to review a larger quantity of sites and installation options to allow measures to be taken to meet the planned programme and generating capacity.

Two projects, a wind turbine and exploitation of methane gas to generate electricity are located on the Longman landfill site currently owned by the Inverness Common Good Fund. The figures above presume that the Council will lead on these projects and assumes return. Any need to do a share of return (and cost) with Common Good would potentially reduce these income figures.

Assumptions - Income rates and equipment costs have been assessed at current values

* the capital allocation to this project is for £5m, on the basis that projects will be self-financing and the amounts currently indicated on the investment is for the so-far known projects. Additional projects will be brought forward for the future years assuming that these are again able to stand up financially and would be programmed for investing in line with the income.

Consultation feedback	
Summary	
NA	
Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) (<i>link to full EQIA on web if necessary</i>)	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>)	

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Income Generation		
Savings Name	Offshore Wind Farms Community Benefit		
Budget (£m)	N/A	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference IG12

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Secure community benefit income from the development of offshore wind farms; for example the development being planned by Moray Offshore Renewables Ltd in the Moray Firth Western Development Area (Zone 1, Moray West).

According to policy, the Council's approach to Community Benefit is that money is paid to communities, and/or to a Highland Trust Fund to which communities and other groups can apply. Whilst there is no policy provision for CB to be paid direct to HC to fund services, there may be the opportunity for the Council or Council partners and partnerships to seek funding for initiatives from the Highland Trust Fund (once established) or even direct from developers. There is also the potential for CB funding to support communities to deliver Council services alongside Community Challenge Fund, and although there will be no direct income to the Council, savings to Council budgets may be realised.

Savings may be delivered through:

- Community delivery of Council services.
- Highland Trust Fund could potentially be accessed by the Council or Council partnerships
- Support for initiatives aligned with developers' priorities (e.g. training) may attract funding direct from developers.

It is difficult to estimate financial impact at this stage.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19	1.000	0.0
Aggregate	1.000	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

The intervention will contribute to:

"Working together to empower our communities" and specifically:

6.8 Community Challenge Fund

6.9 Community Benefit

Additionally each specific activity funded through this route will contribute to the relevant part of the Council Programme. For example, a training opportunity aimed at young people will contribute to 1.21 Training and apprenticeships for young people aged 16-19.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability – See assumptions

Risks - See assumptions

Assumptions – Four key assumptions:

1. Communities demonstrate willingness and capacity to deliver Council services.

There are examples of communities taking on service delivery through Community Challenge Fund. It is reasonable to assume more will follow. Community Challenge Fund appears to be generating continuing interest.

2. Communities choose to deliver current service levels for a reduced budget rather than an improved service for current budget.

This is the choice presented by the Community Challenge Fund. Communities may elect to make the Council budget go as far as they can by offering additional services, rather than delivering current service levels for a reduced budget. In the latter case there is no saving to the Council.

3. Developers are willing to pay community benefit for offshore developments.

In discussion with Scottish Government on the development of Good Practice Principles for Offshore Community Benefit, developers are proving more resistant to the payment of Community Benefit from offshore renewables than they have been for onshore developments. They are arguing that there is little impact or easily identified host community. With some justification for deep-water arrays, they are also arguing that the technology is not yet proven (so returns cannot be calculated) and that UK Government support for investment on renewables is now much reduced and more competitive making some investments marginal. (NB SSE has recently significantly reduced investment in offshore developments).

4. Highland Trust Fund is established

The Highland Trust Fund has not yet been established. The decision making mechanism is likely to include representation from developers and the community. Any Council initiatives seeking funding from Highland Trust Fund would need to align with the Trust Fund priorities and objectives.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) (<i>link to full EQIA on web if necessary</i>)	

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>)	

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Debt Recovery & Management		
Savings Name	Review of Debt Management		
Budget (£m)	£0.548m	Staffing (FTE)	23.5

Reference PI023

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Review the provision of debt management services, both within the Council and the use of external agencies

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19	0.250	
Aggregate	0.250	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

There are no material risks. The current external contract is being retendered at present and savings are anticipated. This does not pre-empt a wider review of service delivery.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No impact – this proposal should result in more efficient process by better procurement of service.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Treasury Management		
Savings Name	Tactical Borrowing		
Budget (£m)	£57.555m	Staffing (FTE)	n/a

Reference PI041

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Continue existing practice of utilising cash balances as an alternative to new borrowing, to finance capital expenditure in year.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	1.064	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	1.064	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

There is a risk that interest rates will increase, and long-term borrowing will be required to provided cheaper funding and protect the longer term financial interests of the Council.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Depute Chief Executive & Director of Corporate Development			Reference	PIM1
Activity Heading	Entitlements				
Savings Name	Simplifying & Streamlining Entitlements Process				
Budget (£m)	n/a	Staffing (FTE)	n/a		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

At present customers have to complete application forms for a number of different benefits and entitlements (16 separate processes), which are then processed in different parts of the Council. This project will redesign how the Council deals with requests for, and payments of, all forms of benefits and entitlements.

All benefits and entitlements processes will be reviewed and redesign to reduce the staff effort required to deal with them and to improve the service we offer customers. This will include reducing manual processes and automating where possible, removing duplication and requesting information from customers once and reusing. It is also planned to have one team dealing with all benefits and entitlements. Benefits and entitlements applications will also be available on-line and via the Service Centre so improving access for customers.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.180	6.0
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.180	6.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Supports delivery of the Council Programme in relation to empowering our communities – specifically improving public access to the council; resolving customer enquiries at first point of contact; improving public engagement and modernising service delivery to make the council more efficient and effective.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability

This project is deliverable and the council has the technology and processes in place to deliver the project.

Risks

Customers who can't or who are not able to access service on-line will still need to have access to face to face services which will continue to be provided through retained service points and council offices.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i> (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)	

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i>	

Budget Template

Sponsor	Depute Chief Executive & Director of Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Attendance Management		
Savings Name	Attendance Management		
Budget (£m)	n/a	Staffing (FTE)	n/a

Reference PIM2

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Further reduction in sickness absence by continuing to adopt a robust and consistent approach to attendance management as reducing absence levels could lead to a reduction in the cost of relief/supply staff and agency workers particularly where there is a requirement to provide immediate cover for absence e.g. teachers, front line staff.

Savings will be achieved from a 5% reduction in costs in 2015/16 and 2% in 2016/17, 1% in 2017/18 and 1% in 2018/19. Savings will be delivered across all services and result in a reduction in spending on agency and relief staff and supply teachers.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.388	
2016/17	0.148	
2017/18	0.072	
2018/19	0.071	
Aggregate	0.679	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability

The savings are deliverable provided the required management action is taken in all services. This will require a change in both behaviours at management and employee level and a change in culture across all services to tackle inappropriate levels of absence.

Risks

None

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1. No impact

2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) (<i>link to full EQIA on web if necessary</i>) Positive impact identified on staff with less absence not putting pressure on workloads of other staff, but approach need to take account of staff who may be absent due to disability – this is already taken included in guidance and policy and will not change.	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) No impact	

Budget Template

Sponsor	Depute Chief Executive & Director of Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Travel, Subsistence & Overtime		
Savings Name	Reduction in Travel, Subsistence & Overtime Costs		
Budget (£m)	n/a	Staffing (FTE)	n/a

Reference PIM2A

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Reduction in the costs of staff travel and subsistence and overtime.

This will be achieved by management action and greater use of technology to prevent the need for travel. It will require a change to working practices across the Council.

Savings will be achieved by a reduction in budgets across all Services.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.326	
2016/17	0.124	
2017/18	0.061	
2018/19	0.060	
Aggregate	0.571	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability

This will be delivered by management action to put in place new and improved working practices and behaviours that can reduce costs across the council.

Risks

All Services will have to deliver a consistent approach and ensure that service delivery is not negatively affected.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

This proposal will not have any negative equality impact on the workforce. It will require a change in management and working practices. These will be implemented in line with the Council policy/terms and conditions.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Community Services		
Activity Heading	Centralise Stores		
Savings Name	Centralise Stores and use Suppliers		
Budget (£m)	£0.963m	Staffing (FTE)	25

Reference

PIM5

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This proposal is to merge stores under one Management Structure

At present there are 5 Housing stores and one shared store. These vary in size and location. The stock value held is in the region of £500k. There are also van stocks which hold the most commonly used spares.

At present within the former TECS there are 8 stores within depots throughout the Highland Council area. Including salt and fuel, the stock holding is approximately £4.2m. These stores carry stock for all former TECS frontline services and a janitorial warehouse which supplies to all Council services, Police Scotland, NHS and HLH outlets.

Initial discussions have taken place with a large multi-national supplier in relation to 'just in time' out sourced provision.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.030	1
2017/18	0.060	1
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.090	2

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability

An assessment will be carried out to evaluate and establish where there is a benefit of merging store locations. Former TECs and Housing do not have stores in common locations, apart from Fort William where there is a shared Store. Merging stores is deliverable and is unlikely to be costly.

Out sourcing stores is deliverable, however the supply chain available locally is not suitable to cover the Council requirement for the whole of Community Services. Strategic stores will have to remain ensuring no interruption to front-line service operation and compliance with financial regulations and audit requirements. There may be benefits in relation to more effective procurement leading to lower unit costs. There are risks in relation to providing a 'one size fits all' model particularly in relation to more remote geographical areas. A mixed model may be the optimum outcome.

Risks

There may be a small risk of additional delivery costs if stores rationalisation with other services takes place and stores are not located in sites suitable for building maintenance.
If external providers are used as a main supplier, there is a small risk to supply and delivery costs and timescales, however these should be addressed through procurement.

Consultation feedback	
Summary	
NA	
Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i> <i>(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)</i>	
No equality impact - this is an internal process to streamline stores and stores activities	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i>	
No rural impact.	

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Community Services		
Activity Heading	Fuel Procurement		
Savings Name	Stores – fuel supplies, excluding Harbours		
Budget (£m)	£1.398m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference PIM8

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Switch fuel card supplier:

A benchmarking exercise was carried out with a different fuel card provider which showed that savings between 1% and 6% might be achievable.

There is an opportunity to close the Council's white diesel (derv) bulk fuel storage and to purchase the fuel on a fuel card. This avoids the need to invest in replacement tanks and fuel monitoring system.

This proposal relates only to white diesel; the Council would still have to store and dispense bulk gas oil as the market place does not currently provide this service widely across the region.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.210	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.210	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability:

A procurement exercise for fuel card suppliers has already begun with the intention that in 2015/16 the Council should benefit from better prices than the current cards.

Replacing bulk fuel tanks with fuel cards is deliverable; generally lower prices for bulk fuel in comparison with fuel cards needs to be balanced against removing the need to maintain fuel tank systems. A saving is expected but it will be low.

There may be an impact on the financial return; however there would be a substantial cost avoidance of capital expenditure and remove the need for ongoing revenue maintenance budget.

Risks:

With no white diesel storage we would be fully dependent on retail sites; if fuel shortages were to happen we would have no contingency.

There is a real risk that the natural volatility of the fuel market may reduce the level of saving

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Depute Chief Executive & Director of Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Licensing		
Savings Name	Licensing Administration		
Budget (£m)	n/a (multiple services)	Staffing (FTE)	25

Reference PIM9

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Creation of a single licensing team to deal with the administration of all licenses (currently dealt with by three separate teams in Corporate Development, Development & Infrastructure and Community Services). This will enable the reduction of 2 FTE.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19	0.050	2.0
Aggregate	0.050	2.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability

This reduction is deliverable.

Risks

No significant risks.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No equality impact. This is a staffing reduction of 2 posts that will be managed and delivered in 2018/19

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Community Services		
Activity Heading	Transport Programme		
Savings Name	Transport Programme		
Budget (£m)	£15.003m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference PIM16

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The primary focus for 2015-19 savings activity is contracts for school and public bus services provision. The transport budget for these services is £15.003m. Activity: seeking contract variation opportunities; home-to-school transport efficiencies; future services provision re-tendering (covering all school and public bus contracts).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.367	
2016/17	0.894	
2017/18	0.766	
2018/19	0.219	
Aggregate	2.246	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

'Working together for the Highlands 2012-17', Priority Number 24 in 'Working together for the economy' – No. 24

Deliverability and Risks

Factors which will impact on deliverability: The Council having previously sought and accomplished passenger transport services efficiencies, thus the starting point is further advanced. The Council's school modernisation programme. The high proportion of statutory provision (80%), although the nature of how and by whom this is provided provides the scope for targeting savings. The response of transport providers to contract variation approaches. The scope for savings identified via the Lochaber home-to-school transport efficiency review. The market's response to proposals developed for future area services provision. The success of supplier development events which will be part of the area services re-tendering activity. Staff resource constraints within Transport Unit.

Risks: Broader programme of Council savings activities demanding staff time. Partnership working causing delay to the pursuit of services revision and savings accomplishment. Potential legal challenge from transport providers as a result of early contract terminations arising out of area service re-tendering activity. Not accounting for all implications of changes suggested for/made to transport services.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Future consultation programme planned.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Other – under development and identified that EQIA needed at later stage

The Transport Programme has already been instigated to secure an overall savings target of £2.246m. Consultation to understand community requirements and priorities, and supplier development events with commercial and community transport organisations, will provide critical form to the proposals which Highland Council will take to market. Challenging traditional solutions formats is also likely to be necessary to secure the correct balance between the level of provision and the future cost of provision. Projects to be developed within the scope of the Programme are:

1. Contact variation opportunities
2. Home-to-school transport efficiencies
3. Future services provision re-tendering (covering all school and public bus contracts) on an area-by-area basis to determine what must be provided, what ought to be provided and the how and by whom this should be provided to deliver appropriate, cost-effective services
4. Exploring the potential for joint logistics operations with NHS Highland
5. Examining the value to be derived from offering reduced funding settlements to community transport groups but made available over a 3-year period instead of the traditional one-year settlements

A key aspect of the Transport Programme will be engaging with the transport and community sectors to aid the process of determining future provision within the budget limit. Feedback from local groups with an interest in equality, particularly those representing disability and older people, has highlighted the importance of an accessible and integrated transport system. As a result it has previously been agreed that proposals emerging from the Transport Programme will be subject to an equality impact assessment as well as a rural impact assessment. The first proposal for the Sutherland area is due to commence early 2015.

All transport provision will be examined for efficiencies. Consultation will be carried out with stakeholder and supplier development events; equality and rural impact evaluations carried out; and wide ranging perspectives brought to the transport programme through its multi-agency Programme Board.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

As above – detailed rural impact assessment to be undertaken as part of the Programme.

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Planning & Development Services		
Savings Name	Additional Services – Discharge of Conditions		
Budget (£m)	£2.953m	Staffing (FTE)	61

Reference PIM17

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This is a proposal to levy a fee for accelerating the delivery of discharge of conditions for large scale projects (generally renewables) within specified timescales. A number of options exist for how this would be delivered, whether through an additional post or by hiring of external assistance to carry out the relevant assessments. It is hoped that provisions for the additional fees/alternative arrangements can be captured within the conditions or legal agreements accompanying the planning permission and discussions are taking place with legal services on that basis.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.040	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.040	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Supports the delivery of major developments thereby supporting the economy.

Deliverability and Risks

Development effort of 0.8 SME and 0.2 Project Mgt

This will be deliverable assuming the development industry see it as a truly value added service. Additional research will be required, including liaison with the industry to establish whether this will be the case, to the best of my knowledge no other local authorities operate this approach (although the western isles did include it within a section 75 agreement for one large scheme).

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No equality impact

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Sponsor	Depute Chief Executive & Director of Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Digital Services		
Savings Name	Channel Shift Activity		
Budget (£m)	n/a	Staffing (FTE)	n/a

Reference PIM20

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

It is intended to increase the number of services accessible on-line, via the Council's website, and via the Council's Service Centre with the target of all services being available through the website and Service Centre and 40% of transactions being on-line by April 2017. This will be in addition to the retained face to face services at Service Points.

In advance of services being made available on-line they will all be re-designed to remove unnecessary manual effort and duplication and work will be automated wherever possible. As a result there will be a reduction in the staff effort required to deliver these services which will deliver efficiency savings from a reduction in staff across all council services.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.190	8
2016/17	0.340	14
2017/18	0.240	10
2018/19	0.350	14
Aggregate	1.120	46.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Supports the commitment to develop more efficient services and making more services accessible on-line.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability

These savings are deliverable and the Council has the technology and processes in place to undertake the work required.

Risks

The key risk will be achieving the business change, service re-design and staffing reductions which will be required to deliver the on-line services and reduce staff effort and costs.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Depute Chief Executive & Director of Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	Mobile Technology		
Savings Name	Development of Mobile Technology		
Budget (£m)	n/a	Staffing (FTE)	n/a

Reference PIM22

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

It is intended to roll out the use of mobile technology (handsets) to enable the Council to take Services to the customer in an efficient paperless way.

The Mobile and Flexible Working Project has been investigating the opportunities for deploying mobile technology across the organisation. It is already established in Housing repairs. Investigations have been undertaken with Council services to establish how mobile working could be implemented and the benefits realised. The benefits are financial (for example, less paper, less travelling) and non-financial (for example, streamlined processes leading to improved services to customers and improved quality of business information).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.128	7
2016/17	0.256	13
2017/18	0.128	7
2018/19	-	
Aggregate	0.512	27.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Supports the Council Programme by supporting more efficient service delivery

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability

These savings are deliverable with the investment in technology and revision of current working practices and task processes.

Risks

- Ability to roll out a Corporate solution that will attain achievable benefits for all Services
- Availability of mobile network may restrict use and therefore reduce benefits
- Staff will change to new way of working (less control over how they go about their work)
- Staff will have/be able to develop the skills necessary to use new technology
- The desired level of interconnectivity between mobile platform and business systems may not be achievable
- Achieving staff reductions when processes are impacted by automation and/or service redesign.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*) (*link to full EQIA on web if necessary*)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (*if required*)

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Community Services		
Activity Heading	Vehicles and Plant		
Savings Name	Reduction in light vehicles and plant		
Budget (£m)	£3.764m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference PIM27

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

A 3 year programme to reduce the number of items of light vehicles and plant utilised full-time by the Council and including all Services. On-going reviews aiming to reduce the following items:

- Light Van – 10 fewer
- Medium Van – 3 fewer
- Pick-up/Tipper – 10 fewer
- 18t 3way Tipper – 2 fewer
- JCB or equivalent – 4 fewer

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.100	
2016/17	0.100	
2017/18	0.100	
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.300	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No direct impact on Council priorities

Deliverability and Risks

A strategy for the 3 years will be needed at the outset involving each Service planning ahead. There is a risk that delivery of some services may become more difficult and that the mix of vehicle and plant savings may need to change as managers work through other savings.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Chief Executive		
Activity Heading	Marine Fuel		
Savings Name	Marine Fuel		
Budget (£m)	-£0.540m (Net)	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference PIM61

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Marine Fuel - commercial approach

The Council should take a commercial approach to the supply of marine fuel which ensures that this budget at least breaks even and any risk carried should be balanced by an appropriate target surplus.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19	0.200	
Aggregate	0.200	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

There is a risk that such an approach may impact on the use and facility of small harbours and therefore on commercial users of these premises

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability is straightforward.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Procurement		
Savings Name	Procurement		
Budget (£m)	N/A	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference PROC1

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This saving will be achieved through more proactive monitoring of expenditure, and reducing the value and quantity of goods and services purchased by Council services for which no contract is in place. This will largely involve services using existing contracts, reducing administration costs and accessing cheaper prices.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.062	
2016/17	0.063	
2017/18	0.062	
2018/19	0.063	
Aggregate	0.250	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Supports the "Economy" theme through more effective purchasing

Deliverability and Risks

The achievement of this saving requires a change of practice across the Council and greater enforcement of contracts.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Procurement		
Savings Name	Product Rationalisation		
Budget (£m)	N/A	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference PROC3

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This saving will be achieved through rationing options available to services to purchase from existing contracts, especially where a range of potential suppliers are included through frameworks. This may place a greater emphasis on price rather than quality.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.050	
2017/18	0.050	
2018/19	0.050	
Aggregate	0.150	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Potential negative impact the "Economy" theme through reduced flexibility on purchasing. However the scale of saving proposed is minimal in the context of overall Council spend.

Deliverability and Risks

The achievement of this saving requires a change of practice across the Council and greater enforcement of contracts.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Treasury Management		
Savings Name	Limit New Borrowing		
Budget (£m)	£57.555m	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference TF031

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Limit new borrowing through a reduction in the scale of the capital programme. Suggested saving is based on a reduction or slippage of £10m in the planned programme for 2015/16 with the saving accruing in the following year. (Other options are possible by varying the scale of reduction).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.830	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.830	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Negative impact on the "Economy" and "Better Infrastructure" themes through a reduction in the scale of capital works procured, and delay in upgrading or replacing Council properties

Deliverability and Risks

The capital programme is already over committed and a revised profiled spend is currently being prepared. Any change in planned expenditure would impact on key commitments to deliver new facilities

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Depute Chief Executive & Director of Corporate Development		
Activity Heading	PFN – SWAN		
Savings Name	Scottish Wide Area Network to replace Pathfinder		
Budget (£m)	£2.835m	Staffing (FTE)	n/a

Reference TN005

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The council will adopt the new Scottish Wide Area Network to replace the current Pathfinder North Network. This will provide a secure wide area network and access to high speed broadband for offices and schools to comply with the UK Government's new stringent security requirements for public service networks and to ensure service delivery across the Highlands. The new service will be delivered at a reduced cost thereby delivering a saving to the Council.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18	0.354	
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.354	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability

Deliverability is high and SWAN will enable the Council to deliver high speed services across THC area to offices and schools at a lower cost than the existing service. There is no staff impact.

Risks

Main risk will be on the transition to the new services which will be managed by the ICT Service.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i> (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)	

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i>	

Budget Template

Sponsor	Depute Chief Executive & Director of Corporate Development			Reference	TN008
Activity Heading	ICT				
Savings Name	Develop ICT Architecture & Related Efficiencies				
Budget (£m)	£2.970m	Staffing (FTE)	n/a		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

ICT efficiencies across the ICT estate including:

- Review of technology architecture
- Review/rationalisation of servers and storage
- Review and rationalisation of systems/applications
- Review and rationalisation of licencing
- Review of supplier service levels
- Review of 3rd party supply commercial arrangements

The Council needs to review what systems it has in place and also any alternative support model required which includes total costs of ownership. However, ICT systems are business led by services at the current time and work would need to be undertaken with services to review their current systems and also their plans for the future. However a working target would be to aim for a 3-5% rationalisation of the current applications spend of £2.97m which would equate to £89,000-£148,000 per annum.

In addition negotiations are taking place with 3rd party suppliers to seek alternative business models and to review how the Council uses its ICT and what can be changed and reduced. This could equate to approximately £100,000 in 2016/17 subject to the Council making the decision to implement and enforce new ways of working.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.200	
2017/18	0.200	
2018/19	0.250	
Aggregate	0.650	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability

Low confidence that this saving is deliverable as significant work needs to be done to reduce the current projected affordability gap before further savings could be made available.

Risks

ICT affordability is the major risk as the council currently has a significant budget pressure, due to previous savings taken from the ICT budget.

Consultation feedback	
Summary	
NA	
Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>) (<i>link to full EQIA on web if necessary</i>)	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact (<i>if required</i>)	

Budget Template

Sponsor	Head of Policy & Reform		
Activity Heading	Supporting Community Organisations to Provide Public Services		
Savings Name	Supporting Community Organisations to Provide Public Services		
Budget (£m)	£1.0m CCF	Staffing (FTE)	1 dedicated FTE & input from other staff

Reference WCG1

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Support to community groups to run services for their community as an alternative to council provision of service.

This includes established social enterprises and new community bodies. Support to include capacity building to community groups to aid their business planning and sourcing external funding (linked to CIP ref IG010) and to engage with partners to do this. Business advice to community groups is provided through Business Gateway, HOL, HISEZ and there is to be a growing role for the Highland Third Sector Interface. There may be scope for LEADER and other European funding to contribute to capacity building linked to groups taking on public service delivery.

Community enterprises are supported by the Council to provide a range of public services in Highland. This is enabled through procurement, outsourcing of services to community run business, support through discretionary grants and more recently through the Community Challenge Fund (CCF).

The community business model is particularly effective where it focuses on public services that require a very local response as community organisations bring their local knowledge, motivation and experience. Good examples are found particularly in areas requiring care and compassion including care services and community transport. This model still requires public subsidy but it can enable more efficient and effective service delivery.

This business model is supported by the new community empowerment legislation to be enacted in 2015 which contains provisions to enable further community ownership of assets and for community bodies to have rights to request to participate in processes to improve outcomes of service delivery (in addition to community ownership models – see WCG3);

Savings estimates are very hard to quantify because it needs the review work for particular services and places to be done and the timing of the savings would depend on community capacity to run services. There may be some quick wins where the council and the third sector currently provide the same services – in these cases the third sector may have more capacity to do more as the service is already established.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.050	tbc
2016/17	0.200	tbc
2017/18	0.300	tbc
2018/19	0.450	tbc
Aggregate	1.000	tbc

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Support programme commitments:

- 1.8: social enterprise strategy
- 1.13: opportunities for local business
- 1.22: EU programmes
- 1.24: rural service delivery
- 6.7: work with third sector
- 6.8: Community Challenge Fund
- 6.10 community business and LEADER
- 6.11: community planning

Deliverability and Risks

Council Impact

The council would lose operational control of the service. Contract compliance would require to be resourced internally.

Staff Impact

The number of people employed directly by the Council would reduce. Numbers would have to be calculated on a case by case basis for each service transferring. Staff may have TUPE rights and transfer to the new provider.

Deliverability

The business model is already in use and there are places for community groups to go for support. This may need to be improved/co-ordinated better. The key will be in identifying which services the Council seeks to use a community business model for and how we respond to approaches from the community. Staff are identified in the ward management function to support the approach and it needs involvement from a range of services. The first year of the CFF shows that communities need support to take on Council services and Council staff need to be supported with that change too.

Risks

We cannot enforce the community business model. Not all communities will have activists or current third sector providers able or willing to take on service delivery. Some community services may not be sustainable and ongoing council support might be needed.

Assumptions

There may be scope for LEADER and other EU funding to contribute to capacity building linked to groups taking on public service delivery. **Estimates are very hard to quantify** because it needs the review work for particular services and places to be done and the timing of the savings would depend on community capacity to run services. We need to beware of double counting savings potential with service reviews being done through CIP. The business model review though could generate large savings, but the review work needs to be done.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Feedback to previous consultations has suggested support for this approach provided the appropriate support and guidance is available for Community groups.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Other – under development or identified that EQIA needed at later stage

There is the **potential for positive impact** – community groups or charities providing the service may provide a better service given their motivation for certain types of work and their experiences in doing that. They may generate more opportunities for volunteering which could help empower some groups in the community.

Potential negative impact – The Council's legal equalities duties continue where the service is outsourced. Community groups may not be equality aware and have policy and practice that exclude people, even unwittingly. Any negative impacts would have to be assessed for each transfer of service to take into account the specific circumstances. However, established charities are registered with OSCAR and any contracts with the council should include equalities monitoring or other criteria. Care services, and some others, may also be subject to external scrutiny and regulation and this would include equalities policy and practice. New community groups established are likely to need support with equalities issues and responsibilities.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required)

Under development, rural impact assessment required at later

The change proposed should mean service retention and possibly service improvement in rural areas. Third sector provision and volunteering are greater in rural communities than elsewhere. Volunteering opportunities should increase. Sustainability could be an issue in communities with an older population profile, or where there are very high levels of volunteering generally and a small pool of volunteers leading to volunteer fatigue.

Budget Template

Sponsor	Head of Policy & Reform		
Activity Heading	Transferring Council Assets into Community Ownership		
Savings Name	Transferring Council Assets into Community Ownership		
Budget (£m)	£1.0m CCF & Capital Disc. Fund	Staffing (FTE)	Several staff affected but none full time on transfer

Reference WCG3

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Support the transfer of assets to community organisation to run and be responsible for on-going maintenance. May require initial capital investment.

To date

Since 2010 the Council has transferred 24 assets into community ownership including 10 village halls and this is in addition to the transfer of the management of some facilities (but where the ownership of the asset stays with the Council). Currently the process is mostly reactive with the procedure through the asset management board. A 3 year disposal programme informs what may be available for disposal but it is a forecast and not fixed. When property is declared surplus the property is notified to CPP property group and if no community interest the Council seeks market receipt to maximum value. A transfer to community ownership is dependent on communities approaching the Council about vacant properties. Most transactions take place for £1 (with discount for the 24 assets transferred so far, based on desktop market values, totalling £1.975m). When a group approaches the Council for a property they may have interest but not capacity to take it on – this can delay the asset disposal process and this has flagged the need for communities to be supported better through the process.

The case to do more

1. The Scottish Government's target to double the progress made so far with one million acres of land to be in community land ownership by 2020.
2. New Community Empowerment legislation, due to be enacted in 2015, introduces a community's right to request an asset transfer of land or buildings from a public body.
3. New Community Learning and Development (CLD) statutory requirement and guidance to jointly target capacity building support to those who need it most.

The Highland CPP has agreed to work together to support communities before, during and after asset transfer.

Of the 24 assets transferred to date, we know the cost of the discount (and subsequent loss of capital receipt to the Council) but we do not know what costs have been avoided; so we need to model costs avoided/prevented as well as recognising wider community benefit to the transfer. We should consider leasing at a peppercorn rent as an interim arrangement. We need to learn lesson from the village halls transfer programme. Whether or not capital investment by the Council prior to transfer is necessary needs careful review and on an individual basis – this may offer an incentive to groups to acquire the asset, but groups themselves can have access to other funding for capital costs and a council contribution as match funding may be more appropriate.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19	0.500	
Aggregate	0.500	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Support programme commitments:

1.8: social enterprise strategy; 1.13: opportunities for local business; 1.22: EU programmes; 1.24: rural service delivery; 6.7: work with third sector; 6.8: Community Challenge Fund; 6.10 community business and LEADER 6.11: community planning

Deliverability and Risks

Council Impact

Transferring assets into community ownership will demonstrate our commitment to community empowerment. Some transfers may involve service delivery contracts.

Staff Impact

If service transfers too then potential TUPE implications. Staff resource needed to make it happen – achievable by refocusing some staff roles and engaging better with partners.

Deliverability

We cannot enforce asset transfer but can incentivise it including through capacity building. The saving is through avoiding property costs including future maintenance. We need to be able to model those future costs better.

Risks

Failure to meet targets for capital receipts generated through sales where nominal rather than market values are applied. Transfer may not be sustainable if overly reliant on volunteers and volunteering fatigue is found.

Assumptions

Savings assume the asset being transferred would have incurred property expenditure within 4 years of the asset transfer but the property transferring may be unused and not scheduled for any repairs. Assumes we may need to offer some capital investment to incentivise community ownership or to provide match funding for improvements. Assumes capital discretionary funding available for this purpose.

Consultation feedback

Summary

Feedback to previous consultations has suggested support for this approach provided the appropriate support and guidance is available for Community groups.

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

EQIA's needed at a later stage on a case-by-case basis as and when

Issue of different capacities across and within communities. Issue of some groups being more or less able to be empowered through this process and concerns that some groups would be excluded. Any capacity building must be inclusive. The community group taking on ownership would have to demonstrate their approach to inclusion as well. Issue of sustainability given our aging population. On the positive side, a community owned asset may improve services for some people more prone to exclusion e.g. transferring an asset to a Women's Aid group. Impacts will depend on how the community group is constituted and who is included and excluded, whether efforts are made to build capacity among excluded groups and depending on the type of services to be provided from the community asset.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact (if required)

Rural impact assessments needed at a later stage on a case-by-case basis as and when

The approach should bring positive - rural impacts with buildings improved and retained locally and made viable; improved amenity of building or land; services sustained or new services developed; more voluntary effort enabled; community groups set up and sustained; and communities empowered. Negative impacts might be the potential for volunteer fatigue where volunteering rates are relatively higher. Risk too of exclusion of some groups in community if they are not encouraged or enabled to volunteer.

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Employability		
Savings Name	Social Impact Bonds		
Budget (£m)	N/A	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Reference WCG6

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Aim is to attract private/community investment into outcomes-based contracts that benefit individuals and communities. Private investment is used to pay for interventions which are delivered by proven service providers. Returns to investors are made by the public sector on the basis of improved social outcomes. Currently Highland council does not utilise social bonds.

Perth and Kinross Council has carried out a similar initiative which started in 2012. They worked with the Dept for Work and Pensions and the YMCA to provide training places for 300 young people at a cost of £300k. This was raised from private individuals and organisations with investments of between £5000 and £50000. Potential investment for the Highland region is estimated at around £550k.

£50k investment required for consultancy in 2015/16.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	-0.050	
2016/17	0.150	
2017/18	0.150	
2018/19	0.250	
Aggregate	0.500	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

N/A

Deliverability and Risks

Council Impact

- Significant change in delivery of children's services.
- Would require new arrangements for procurement, management of contracts and accounting.
- Could require the creation of a dedicated project team to oversee outcomes and project performance.
- Reduced financial risk as risk is transferred to social investors.

Staff Impact

- Reduced workload for staff in children's services, particularly front line employees as duties are taken over by procured organisation.
- Staff may be asked to perform more project management/admin roles in response to change in delivery.
- This will lead to a reduction in effort equivalent of approximately 9 staff where redeployment and other reconfiguration will be used to reduce the headcount

Consultation feedback	
Summary	
NA	
Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i> <i>(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)</i> Other – under development or identified that EQIA needed at later stage There is the potential for positive equality impact as customers may receive care from specialist organisations which can more easily be designed around individual needs, and may provide access to services that the Council is unaware of. There may be 24/7 support if required. Full consultation with Children's Services would be required.	
Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)	
1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage
Summary of impact <i>(if required)</i> Potential rural impact but not known at present - under development, rural impact assessment required at later stage	

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Community Services		
Activity Heading	Waste Disposal		
Savings Name	Energy from Waste (EfW)		
Budget (£m)	£11.958m	Staffing (FTE)	21

Reference WD2

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The proposal is to replace the current disposal regime with one based on EFW. The Council currently favours a model of three EfW plants: Skye, Caithness and Inner Moray Firth. Currently an outline business case is being prepared by consultants to consider the proposal in full, including risks and estimated costs.

The saving of £2.8M was calculated simply from a 70kT residual being disposed of at an average of £100/T instead of £140/T (landfill charge during 2013-14). The latter is subject to change (up and down) given the need for operators to fill and close sites by 2021 and landfill tax. Therefore the comparative cost/saving will vary depending on the chosen benchmark year.

Landfill disposal (in Scotland) of municipal biodegradable waste must cease by 1 January 2021.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19	2.800	
Aggregate	2.800	N/A

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Increased diversion from landfill
Improvement in Carbon footprint.

Deliverability and Risks

Delivery within the timescale (c. 3 years) – very tight

Public acceptance.

Capacity need/cost (plant with 25 year life) - cannot be reliably predicted nor on the amount which will be diverted by other means.

Future Policy/legislative environment changes.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

This is a change to disposal of waste and will therefore not affect the public-facing part of the service.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact identified

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Community Services		
Activity Heading	Waste Disposal		
Savings Name	Anaerobic Digestion		
Budget (£m)	£11.958m	Staffing (FTE)	21

Reference WD3

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

This proposal originated from the corporate scan of initiatives across Scotland. Fife Council has recently commissioned an Anaerobic Digestion plant to feed its existing district heating system in Dunfermline and this was suggested as a possible fit for Highland. Consultants are currently reviewing the application of AD in Highland.

The proposed saving is therefore not based on the AD plant itself but rather on reduced staffing in collection by co-collection of food and green garden waste (which currently is collected separately because it's cheaper to process than mixed).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19	0.200	8
Aggregate	0.200	8

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

May reduce diversion (recycling and carbon) given there will be less space in the brown bin for food/green waste given the reduced frequency of collection and storage capacity.

Deliverability and Risks

AD may not be cheaper than current arrangements - consultants will report on the affordability in the near future. Loss of food waste tonnage.

AD plants for mixed waste-streams tend not to be simple to operate efficiently and effectively.

Need to find a use for the gas-offtake.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

No impact

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Care & Learning		
Savings Name	Rationalisation of Leisure Management		
Budget (£m)	N/A	Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Ref WPP1-TC1

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Review of provision of support services to rationalise and achieve management efficiencies.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.200	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.200	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

This outcome is not within the direct control of the Council and would require the agreement of external organisations.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No impact identified to customers

Under development – too early to know impact on staff

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Under development, rural impact assessment required at later

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Care & Learning - Care Performance & Contracting		
Savings Name	Shared Services – Care Performance & Contracting		
Budget (£m)	£0.460m	Staffing (FTE)	13

Ref WPP4-SSJV4

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Opportunity to generate efficiency savings through a Shared Service model, following the creation of a new Care & Learning Service and bringing together teams that manage performance and commissioning of services. Options and proposals are still being scoped, and needs to include discussions with NHS Highland, where the main budgets are held.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.032	1.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.032	1.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability depends on the outcome of discussions with NHS Highland and developing a model that meets the needs of different parts of the service, ranging from Education to Adult and Children's care services.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Trading Standards		
Savings Name	Shared Support Services – Trading Standards		
Budget (£m)	£0.814m	Staffing (FTE)	17 (Highland) 6 (Moray)

Ref WPP4-SSJV5

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The proposal is that Highland Council and Moray Council share Trading standards services. The Highland and Moray Trading Standards Service would be delivered by Highland Council via a Service Agreement with Moray Council. Moray TS staff would become Highland Council TS staff. The savings (£40K) would come from anticipated efficiencies in service delivery resulting from re-structuring and vacancy management

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.040	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.040	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

No impact on the Council Programme

Deliverability and Risks

The risks are that Highland and Moray Council cannot agree on a joint delivery model and/or that the anticipated saving cannot be fully realised.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

No equality impact – service would continue in both Highland and Moray and this proposal would be an efficiency saving.

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

No rural impact anticipated – efficiencies would be sought through re-structuring and vacancy management, the current offices would continue.

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Building Standards		
Savings Name	Shared Support Services – Building Standards		
Budget (£m)	£1.291m	Staffing (FTE)	28

Ref WPP4-SSJV6

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Shared Service arrangement potentially with Moray Council (or island authorities). This is at a very early stage and no work has been carried out to determine what model might generate the amount of savings that are quoted here. Building Standards have been asked to look at best practice elsewhere, to determine what work is required to make this achievable.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.040	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.040	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

Early stages of proposal and work required to determine if this is achievable and what model might generate the amount of savings quoted.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact but mitigated or positive
3.	Full impact assessment undertaken
4.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

1.	No impact
2.	Some impact identified
3.	Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Depute Chief Executive & Director of Corporate Development			Reference	WPP4-SSJV8
Activity Heading	Support Services - Legal & Democratic Services				
Savings Name	Share Support Services – Legal & Democratic Services				
Budget (£m)	n/a	Staffing (FTE)	n/a		

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Potential to share services with neighbouring council and to reduce cost of purchasing external legal services

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.040	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.040	0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

This is deliverable providing that an appropriate partner can be found. Assuming a successful partnership can be developed then the risks to the council are low.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required) (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Finance - Procurement		
Savings Name	Shared Services - Procurement		
Budget (£m)	£0.616m	Staffing (FTE)	15.6

Ref WPP4-SSJV9

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Shared Service opportunity through more effective working cross public sector bodies within and outwith Highland.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.040	1.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.040	1.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Positive impact on the "Economy" theme through more targeted procurement and support for local businesses.

Deliverability and Risks

This proposal requires the active cooperation and support of other public sector bodies to achieve a successful outcome.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Finance - Internal Audit – Computer Audit		
Savings Name	Shared Services – Computer Audit		
Budget (£m)	£0.391m	Staffing (FTE)	11.0

Ref WPP4-SSJV10

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Shared Service opportunity through more effective working cross public sector bodies within and outwith Highland. This proposal focusses on the potential to sell Computer Audit services to other councils.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.020	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.020	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

This proposal requires the active cooperation and support of other public sector bodies to achieve a successful outcome. The Service already provides this service to Western Isles Council, and it is not a service provided internally in many councils.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Finance – Business Support		
Savings Name	Shared Services – Business Support		
Budget (£m)	£5.013m	Staffing (FTE)	341.94

Ref WPP4-SSJV12

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Shared Service opportunity through more effective working cross public sector bodies within and outwith Highland.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.100	4.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.100	4.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

This proposal requires the active cooperation and support of other public sector bodies to achieve a successful outcome.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Finance – Revenues		
Savings Name	Shared Services - Revenues		
Budget (£m)	£2.342m	Staffing (FTE)	175.84

Ref WPP4-SSJV13

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Shared Service opportunity through more effective working with other local authorities. This could involve the provision of services to other authorities, generating income and securing jobs within the Highlands.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.100	4.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.100	4.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Potential positive outcome on the “Economy” and “Caring Communities” themes if the Council is able to do additional work for other authorities.

Deliverability and Risks

This proposal requires the active cooperation and support of other local authorities to achieve a successful outcome.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Finance – Corporate Fraud		
Savings Name	Shared Services – Corporate Fraud		
Budget (£m)	£0.154m	Staffing (FTE)	6.0

Ref WPP4-5-SSJV5

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Shared Service opportunity through more effective working with other local authorities. This could involve the provision of services to other authorities, generating income and securing jobs within the Highlands.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17	0.025	1.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.025	1.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Potential positive outcome on the “Economy” and “Caring Communities” themes if the Council is able to do additional work for other authorities.

Deliverability and Risks

This proposal requires the active cooperation and support of other local authorities to achieve a successful outcome. There are implications arising from the DWP decision to create a single fraud service for Scotland. Not all councils are retaining an internal fraud team, thereby increasing opportunities for a shared service.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* (link to full EQIA on web if necessary)

Rural impacts (assessment results in bold)

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Corporate Development – Learning & Development		
Savings Name	Shared Services – Learning & Development		
Budget (£m)	£0.554m	Staffing (FTE)	13.2

Ref WPP4-5-SSJV8

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Shared Service opportunity through more effective working cross public sector bodies within and outwith Highland. This proposal focusses on the potential to sell Learning & Development services.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.025	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.025	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

This proposal requires the active cooperation and support of other public sector bodies to achieve a successful outcome.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Corporate Development – Health & Safety		
Savings Name	Shared Services		
Budget (£m)	£0.358m	Staffing (FTE)	9.0

Ref WPP4-5-SSJV9

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

Shared Service opportunity through more effective working cross public sector bodies within and outwith Highland. This proposal focusses on the potential to sell Health & Safety services.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16	0.025	
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.025	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

None

Deliverability and Risks

This proposal requires the active cooperation and support of other public sector bodies to achieve a successful outcome.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

Budget Template

Sponsor	Director of Finance		
Activity Heading	Money Advice		
Savings Name	Money Advice		
Budget (£m)	£1.532m	Staffing (FTE)	14.6

Reference WPP9

Savings Proposal *(detailed description, including implications for service delivery)*

The proposal will examine the effectiveness of the current mixed approach to in house and external advisory services to ensure that resources are targeted in the most effective manner.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2015/16		
2016/17		
2017/18		
2018/19	0.130	
Aggregate	0.130	0.0

Impact on Council Programme *(please state if any)*

Potential impact on "Caring Communities" theme

Deliverability and Risks

This saving will require positive engagement with Citizens Advice Bureaux across the Highlands. There is also the risk of increasing demand for services as the wider impacts of welfare reform impact.

Consultation feedback

Summary

NA

Equalities impact *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact but mitigated or positive |
| 3. | Full impact assessment undertaken |
| 4. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)* *(link to full EQIA on web if necessary)*

The nature of advice and information services means that the groups most likely affected by this budget proposal are gender, age, disability and pregnancy/maternity as these groups claim benefits and access money and housing advice. Some clients also access employment advice.

A comprehensive review of advice services, including the current provision, and the mix between CABx and in-house teams is planned. This review will consider the most effective service delivery model, ways of working, service provision, and future likely impacts arising from welfare reform and other legislative changes

http://www.highland.gov.uk/downloads/download/404/equality_impact_assessments

Rural impacts *(assessment results in bold)*

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | No impact |
| 2. | Some impact identified |
| 3. | Impact assessment to be undertaken at a later stage |

Summary of impact *(if required)*

To be undertaken as part of the review referred to above.