

Highland Council

25 February 2016

Revenue Budget 2016/17 – 2018/19

Details of Budget Savings

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/1
Activity Heading	Council Tax				
Savings Name	Efficiency Savings				
Current Budget (£m)	£114.196m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

More targeted approach to prior year debt resulting in improved collection and reduction in bad debts provision.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.915	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.915	0

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

None.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This savings proposal represents an improvement in performance and assumes a higher level of tax collection.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	More proactive approach to debt will impact on those who may be struggling to pay their council tax.
Mitigating action	Promote income maximisation and money advice services to support people in debt to ensure that they are maximising benefits available to them.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

A lot of this work has already been done through improved recovery procedures, review of single person discounts, reassessment of collection assumptions, and bad debts provision. Improvements (achieved) in the current financial year will roll forward. Risk arises from the wider impact of welfare reforms and an increase in the number of people struggling to manage their finances.

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/2
Activity Heading	Council Tax				
Savings Name	Review of Base Assumptions				
Current Budget (£m)	£114.196m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

Amendment to base assumptions of growth in tax base, following work on reassessing single person discounts and property growth.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.250	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.250	0

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

None.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This savings proposal represents an improvement in performance and assumes a higher level of tax collection

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Reassessment of single person discount will remove the discount from those who are no longer entitled to the discount and who have failed to advise the Council of their change in circumstances.
Mitigating action	Promote income maximisation and money advice services to support people in debt to ensure that they are maximising benefits available to them.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This work has been undertaken in the early part of 2015 and is largely complete other than an ongoing review. The full data base has been reviewed. Risks arise from assumptions about growth in the tax base, through additional housebuilding, not occurring at the rate envisaged.

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/3
Activity Heading	Welfare				
Savings Name	Reduction in Scheme payments				
Current Budget (£m)	£12.287m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

Reduction in budget to reflect current cost of Council Tax Reduction Scheme, net of DWP Grant

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.279	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.279	0

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

None.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There are no performance issues.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	None on the basis that this budget adjustment simply reflects a reduction in caseload and reduction in entitlement.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

There are no deliverability issues. Risks arise out of assumptions around caseload, calculation of the level of reduction of DWP Administration Grant and demand for School Clothing Grants. There is also a risk that the Scottish Government may reduce the allowance for Council Tax Reduction within the wider grant settlement.

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/4
Activity Heading	Payroll/Creditors				
Savings Name	Efficiency Savings				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.654m	Current Staffing (FTE)	23.0		

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

Net efficiency savings arising from the introduction of new processes and systems to the core financial management system (Integra) and payroll/personnel administration (ResourceLink) through move to online forms reducing manual input and checking.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.030	1.0
2017/18	0.015	0.5
2018/19		
Total	0.045	1.5

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

None.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The successful implementation of new systems and processes will improve overall performance.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Improved systems will improve performance of suppliers and provide more management information.
Mitigating action	None required.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

IT systems are subject to development during 2015/16. Deliverability of this saving depends on the successful implementation of these new processes. Project plans are in place.

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/5
Activity Heading	Internal Audit				
Savings Name	Efficiency Savings				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.523m	Current Staffing (FTE)	13.0		

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

Deletion of 1 FTE vacant clerical post, reduction of hours, and minor adjustments to grade. No impact on Audit Plan.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.029	1.2
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.029	1.2

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

None.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No material change. Reducing the establishment of Internal Audit reduces the capacity to undertake additional work, but still allows the annual statement of internal control to be produced.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	There is no material change to the level of audit cover provided
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	None required.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The saving has largely been achieved through the non-filling of a vacant place. Agreement is in place to deliver the balance of the saving.

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/7
Activity Heading	Money Advice				
Savings Name	Review provision of internal & external services				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.490m	Current Staffing (FTE)	11.0		

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

Review provision of money advice services, to consider current split between internal services and those provided by external providers.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.130	5.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.130	5.0

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

This service provides support for the most disadvantaged and those experiencing debt. The council's advice and information contracts with external providers provide mitigation for this proposal.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This proposal is about achieving the same (or better) outcomes wherever practicable at less cost. It will include exploring links with Community Services (Housing) and a reduced in-house provision, overall.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	An equalities screening, and if required a full EQIA, will be undertaken as part of this review and mitigation identified where appropriate.
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, potential equality impact identified. Screening, and if required a full EQIA, will be undertaken as part of the review.

Deliverability and Risks

Staffing reduction can be managed through a combination of vacancy management and voluntary severance.

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/8
Activity Heading	Loans Fund				
Savings Name	Investment of Cash Balances				
Current Budget (£m)	£57.060m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

The proposal is to extend the investment period for short term cash investments to secure a higher rate of return.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.065	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.065	0

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This will improve service performance by achieving a higher level of investment return from surplus cash balances.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	No impact on any customers.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

There are no specific risks. Any material change in interest rates is likely to increase returns further, but may change the current borrowing strategy. This saving needs to be seen in conjunction with the wider treasury strategy.

Budget Template

Service	Finance		Ref.	FIN/9
Activity Heading	Revenues & Business Support			
Savings Name	Service Restructuring			
Current Budget (£m)		Current Staffing (FTE)		

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

The Service already has an agreed savings target of £0.324 (15/16) and £0.200 (16/17) agreed by Council in December 2014. This proposal increases the target by reducing the number of posts required in the restructured service.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.205	7.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.205	7.0

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Negligible. The Service is introducing a number of efficiency measures to improve performance and reduce workload for staff. It is anticipated that the savings target can be increased without any material impact on performance.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	No impact on any customers.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The staffing reductions have been achieved to a greater extent during 2015/16, and performance of the Service has actually improved over the same period. Additional nominations for voluntary severance have been received that will enable this saving to be delivered with certainty.

Budget Template

Service	Finance		Ref.	FIN/10
Activity Heading	Corporate Finance & Procurement			
Savings Name	Service Restructuring			
Current Budget (£m)		Current Staffing (FTE)		

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

Early retirement of Head of Corporate Finance allows an internal restructuring and a review (and reduction) of 3rd and 4th tier posts. The Service is actively pursuing a Shared Service arrangement for Procurement with Aberdeen City & Aberdeenshire Councils and needs to delete the Head of Service post to facilitate this change. Pending the outcome of this initiative the Procurement function will be managed under a revised remit for the Head of Corporate Finance.

On performance.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.164	2.5
2017/18	0.026	0.5
2018/19		
Total	0.190	3.0

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The changes in Procurement are expected to deliver further revenue savings. Reductions in Corporate Finance will be managed without a significant impact

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	No impact on any customers.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

There are no specific risks around these proposals. Steps are in place to deliver these savings. Some changes will only take place after completion and audit of the 2015/16 accounts to ensure service continuity and transfer of knowledge and experience.

Budget Template

Service	Finance			Ref.	FIN/11
Activity Heading	Council Tax Reduction Scheme				
Savings Name	Benefit Payments				
Current Budget (£m)	£12.287m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

Anticipated reduction in total payments made under the Council Tax Reduction Scheme due to persons' entitlement to benefit reducing due to changes in other benefits and uplifts in income and general improvements in employment levels.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.383	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.383	0

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

None.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There is no impact on service performance

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	More proactive approach to debt will impact on those who may be struggling to pay their council tax.
Mitigating action	Promote income maximisation and money advice services to support people in debt to ensure that they are maximising benefits available to them.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This saving represents a reduction in anticipated expenditure due to factors out with the Council's control. There is a risk that expenditure will exceed the Council's forecast. However the forecast is based on the trend over the two previous years and it is a reasonable assumption that this trend will continue.

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development			Ref.	CD/1
Activity Heading	Contract Savings				
Savings Name	Re-procurement of mobile/landline telephony and SWAN contracts				
Current Budget (£m)	Fixed Telephony £0.278m Mobile Telephony £0.216m SWAN £2.835m TOTAL £3.329m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

To achieve efficiencies via better procurement of mobile and landline telephony contracts and to take increased savings from the Scottish Government Scottish Wide Area Network contract.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.300	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.300	0

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

No impact

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The 3 service areas are as follows:

1. Mobile telephony – provision of mobile phones as part of the public sector framework contract. The opportunity to join a large public sector contract will give the Council annual savings without affecting service delivery
2. Landline telephony – the council has to re-procure its telephony provision and as such will use the re-procurement to deliver savings whilst maintaining the same level of service across the Council
3. Scottish Wide Area Network (SWAN) Contract for public sector broadband. This is a national NHS/SG contract which will connect all of the public sector agencies across Scotland to a shared secure wide area network. The Council has joined the procurement as a primary/vanguard partner and as such is getting the benefits of savings from Scotland wide aggregation – there will be no reduction in service, however there may be a delay in savings in the roll out of the new SWAN contract is delayed or if the Council increases its service requirements e.g. bandwidth.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Service will remain the same - no changes anticipated
If YES, state why	

Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities summary Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.	

Deliverability and Risks

There is a risk on the SWAN savings that any delay in the transition to the new contract or changes in requirement e.g. for increased bandwidth, would increase charges and thereby reduce savings. Currently the transition is delayed and so there is a significant risk of slippage, however officers continue to manage this closely to minimise any impact on service delivery and savings.

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development Service			Ref.	CD/3
Activity Heading	Staffing Reductions				
Savings Name	Staffing Reductions				
Current Budget (£m)	£8.756m	Current Staffing (FTE)	230		

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

In order to deliver further budget savings in 2016/17 it will be necessary to reduce staff numbers within the Service. [This will be in addition to the £143k = 3 FTE already agreed for 2016/17 as part of the budget agreed in December 2014].

The reductions will be achieved through re-organisation and the use of targeted Voluntary Severance and/or Early Retirement, wherever possible, with some reductions also achieved through vacancy management.

The proposals include the re-organisation of ICT Services, to align the Service to the new ICT Contract arrangements, and reductions across all other Services, including a number of management posts.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.380	10
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.380	10

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

There will be an impact on all services and the capacity to support the Council Programme will be reduced particularly within the HR, ICT and Legal Teams. The further reduction in staff, particularly management posts, will reduce the capacity for new and current initiatives and programmes of work, without additional resources being provided, including any further expansion of Committees/Member Working Groups. The reduction in management posts in Legal will diminish the resource available to support both major projects and regulatory activities including the work of the PACs and Licensing Board/Committee. The loss of the two posts identified will reduce/remove the legal presence in Wick and Portree impacting directly upon both the availability of legal advice locally and opportunity to assist with Sheriff Court attendance with consequent costs arising if officers have to travel from HQ or if third party solicitors are instructed.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The services impacted are corporate professional services, including HR, ICT and Legal which, on the whole, provide support to all Council Services and Elected Members. It is expected that the further reduction in staff will result in response times to requests taking longer, work will have to be prioritised and low priority work will not be undertaken in-house. Managers will be re-structuring teams in these services to accommodate reductions in staffing and in order to ensure that workloads for the remaining staff are manageable and priority work is undertaken.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	All Services impacted are corporate professional services and therefore support internal customers and some external customers including High Life Highland and the Joint Valuation Board.
If YES, state why	

Mitigating action	There will be a heightened need to prioritise work and there is an increased risk that response times to requests will take longer and some work will not be done due to the reduction in capacity.	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		No
Equalities summary Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.		

<p>Deliverability and Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a risk of loss of expertise and knowledge if more experienced and long serving members of staff choose to leave the organisation. • Risk that response times will increase and some low priority work will no longer be deliverable due to the reduced capacity within the workforce.
--

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development Service			Ref.	CD/4
Activity Heading	ICT Contract				
Savings Name	ICT Contract				
Current Budget (£m)	£8.278m	Current Staffing (FTE)	27		

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

The ICT Contract represents a significant annual spend for the Council and supports the delivery of all corporate and curriculum ICT Services including all offices and facilities and all secondary and primary schools. The contract also delivers services to partners including High Life Highland and the Valuation Joint Board.

The Contract has delivered significant savings since 2010 and next year is the last of the current arrangement with a re-procurement exercise underway to award a new Contract in the summer which will commence delivery of service from early 2017 onwards.

Savings for 2016/17 will be achieved by moving to the new Managed Print Service early, within the current year, and in advance of the new Contract. This will enable the Council to benefit from most cost effective services. The savings for 2017/18 and 2018/19 will be built into the new Contract with the successful supplier being expected to deliver savings annually across the 5 years on the Contract.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.250	
2017/18	0.170	
2018/19	0.170	
Total	0.590	n/a

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

It is not expected that there will be a negative impact on the Council Programme.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

It is not expected that this proposal will have a negative impact on service delivery. The savings focus on cost reduction and introducing more efficient service delivery rather than reductions in the service. The new Contract will include investment in a refresh of the computer estate which in itself will support more efficient ways of working and improved learning outcomes.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	No negative impact on service delivery.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	

2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities summary Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.	

Deliverability and Risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deliverability of these savings will depend on the successful award of a new Contract and a transition to those new arrangements early in 2017; • The ability to deliver savings in 2016/17 will be wholly reliant on the co-operation of the current provider to support an early change to the new Managed Print Service contract and to do that with minimal legal or financial penalty.
--

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Development Service			Ref.	CD/5
Activity Heading	Corporate Performance Team				
Savings Name	Reduction in Corporate Performance Team				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.220m	Current Staffing (FTE)	4		

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

To reduce the team by 25% to 3 FTE. This will have an impact on services delivered by the team to Members and other Services in the Council, specifically the team will need to focus on ensuring the council complies with its statutory requirements in respect of Public Performance Reporting and Local Government Bench-Marking Framework.

Work that will not be undertaken in the future includes self-assessment and improvement work and direct support for services in undertaking performance management.

There will also be reduced capacity to support the Community Planning Partnership and to manage the future Best Value Audit of the Council.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.040	1
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.040	1

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

There will be no direct impact on the Council Programme and the priority will be on ensuring the Council meets its statutory requirements.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There will be an impact on self-assessment and improvement work which will no longer be supported by the team. This could lead to an impact on service performance and improvement work and presents risks when the next Best Value Audit of the Council is undertaken.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The work to improve public performance reporting will not proceed at required pace due to the reduced capacity to undertake this work.
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

- Key risk is the cessation of self-assessment and improvement work;
- Also a risk of a poorer outcome from the next Best Value Audit due to the reduced capacity available to the council to prepare for and manage this work;
- New Community Empowerment Act means that there will be additional responsibilities on councils around performance reporting and this proposal will remove the capacity to undertake any new work in this area.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/1
Activity Heading	Chief Executive's				
Savings Name	Reduction on training and misc budgets				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.449m	Current Staffing (FTE)	4FTE		

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

A reduction across a range of non-staffing headings as follows:

- £4k training
- £1k Meals and hospitality
- £0.8k accommodation
- £0.5k conference and seminar expenses
- £1k stationary
- £5k payments to contractors
- £2k postages
- £1.5k employers liability
- £1.2k Misc supplies

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.017	0
2017/18	0	0
2018/19	0	0
Total	0.017	0

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

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	This only impacts internally
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This leaves nothing in the budget for unanticipated expenses so there is a real risk of pressures emerging over the course of the year. However, these are unlikely to be sizeable.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/2
Activity Heading	Information Management				
Savings Name	Reduction in staffing				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.099m	Current Staffing (FTE)	3FTE		

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

A reduction in the fte of the Customer Services Officer post from 35 hours to 25 hours p/w. The post is not vacant so this is a compulsory reduction in hours.

The post holder's hours will be made up by covering for another post holder who has reduced their hours voluntarily through phased retirement. When this arrangement comes to an end there will be a need to review the situation again.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.007	0.3
2017/18	0	0
2018/19	0	0
Total	0.007	0.3

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

There may be a reduction in performance in handling complaints/FOI/Data Protection and Ombudsman but this can be mitigated by the manager taking on more routine tasks when needed, such as logging cases at times when there is pressure due to the caseload.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Whilst there may be an impact on customers this will be spread across all groups and geographies
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This will need to be taken this forward with the assistance of HR.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/3
Activity Heading	Corporate Development				
Savings Name	Reduction in grants and training				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.034m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

£10,000 will be cut from the Chief Executive's Discretionary Grants budget

This budget is already due to be reduced by £5k in 2016/17 and by a further £5k in 2017/18 as part of the savings measures agreed at Council in December 2014. Removing a further £10,000 will mean that the total budget will have reduced to £10,284 by 2017/18.

In 2015/16 this budget helped to fund the following:

A new Highland Gateway sign on the A9; assistance to Cuillin FM to repair a storm damaged transmitter; repairs to Council HQ car park; the cost of changing the lighting of Ness Bridge and Inverness Castle to highlight charitable causes; a First World War research project.

£2,000 reduction in the corporate training budget will remove it altogether, but the catering budget for corporate meetings and training of £500 will be retained. In future, corporate training events like the quarterly management briefings will have to be held in Council buildings where costs can be kept to a minimum.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.012	0
2017/18	0	0
2018/19	0	0
Total	0.012	0

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

No direct impact on the Programme.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The grants are generally spread to projects across Highland and change from one year to the next
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The grants budget has been used in the past to help support Council and non-Council projects that would otherwise have insufficient funding to get done. It will be straightforward to make the saving but in future years fewer projects will receive assistance as the total budget available will reduce to £10,000.

The training budget is used for a small number of corporate training and communications events, such as the quarterly management briefings and ELT Awaydays. We will need to do fewer of them and also ensure we use Council premises to keep costs to a minimum.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/4
Activity Heading	Information Management				
Savings Name	Removal of training and miscellaneous budgets				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.099m	Current Staffing (FTE)	3FTE		

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

£5,724 Misc staffing no longer required; £971 ICT no expenditure anticipated

The following savings arise from removing budgets that tend only to be used when staff are attending training events and conferences in Edinburgh. Now there is no training or conference budget left, there should be no associated spend on the following budgets:

£93 Subsistence reduce the budget; £132 Travel remove the budget; £80 Meals remove the budget.

It is helpful for our FOI Manager to be able to attend the small number of events hosted by the Information Commissioner each year as this helps to ensure we are up to date with changes in legislation and case law, it raises the Council's profile and develops positive relations with the ICO - for example, this year the Information Commissioner asked our FOI Manager to deliver a presentation on her behalf when she had to cancel her attendance at a 3rd Sector Interface event at short notice. The fact that this will no longer be possible will therefore have negative consequences but we have no other budget available to remove in order to meet our savings.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.007	0
2017/18	0	0
2018/19	0	0
Total	0.007	0

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

No impact on the Council Programme

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The impact will not affect any particular group or geography
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This is deliverable – the risks are that the Council's profile and knowledge will be adversely effected but we will work to mitigate this.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's			Ref.	CEO/5
Activity Heading	Corporate Communications				
Savings Name	Additional income - advertising in In Brief; the Intranet and Website. Promoted posts fees				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.168m	Current Staffing (FTE)	5.6FTE		

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

Proposals for additional income are as follows:

Income from monthly Advertising in In Brief £2,500. It has been specified that adverts should have a benefit to staff.

Income from Promoted facebook posts fees £500

Intranet and splashscreen estimated advertising £1,000

Estimated advertising income on the Traffic website £3,000 This is a joint HiTrans/Council website

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.007	-
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.007	-

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

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Savings mainly based on income generation rather than service reduction
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

There is already a high target of income generation against the budget. Forecasts of income from advertising are estimated, but cannot be guaranteed.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's			Ref.	CEO/6
Activity Heading	Corporate Communications				
Savings Name	Reduction in Quality Awards and Hospitality budget				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.168m	Current Staffing (FTE)	5.6FTE		

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

Proposals for savings are as follows:

Reduction in the budget for Meals and Hospitality (Receptions and Convener gifts etc) £880
 Reduction in the Quality Awards budget by £1,000 The 2015 event attracted good sponsorship support. The Awards are service wide and quality of event may need to be curtailed if costs cannot be covered by sponsorship next year.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.002	-
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.002	-

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

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Quality Awards are important for valuing staff, however sponsorship should mean that the Awards can still go ahead on a reduced budget
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Sponsorship was successfully achieved in 2015 and it is anticipated that new sponsors may be identified.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/7
Activity Heading	Policy, Reform and Ward Management				
Savings Name	Reduction in Ward Discretionary Grant				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.327m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

The Ward Discretionary Budget is made up of:

- £1,178,518 for Ward Discretionary Grants - £53,569 per Ward in 2015/16
- £148,467 for the Discretionary Youth Budget - £4,879 per Ward, apart from in Wards 1 and 5 where the youth budget is £7,203 and in Wards 3, 7 and 8 where it is £17,062.

The Council agreed in December 2014 a reduction in Ward Discretionary Grant by £36k each year for the next 3 years. For 2016/17 the budget would reduce to £1,142,526 (£51,933 per ward) in 2016/17.

The proposals are to reduce the ward discretionary budget overall by £519,788 in 2016/17, split by:

1. Removing the discretionary youth budget of £148,467; and
2. Reducing the Ward Discretionary Grants by a further 32.5% in 2016/17, amounting to £371,321. If agreed, and because of the earlier savings agreed for future years, the profile would become:
 - £771,205 in 2016/17 (£35,055 per ward)
 - £735,283 in 2017/18 (£33,422 per ward)
 - £699,361 in 2018/19 (£31,789 per ward)

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.519	0
2017/18	0	0
2018/19	0	0
Total	0.519	0

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

The Council's Programme has commitments to supporting localism and for community-run services. A reduced budget means doing less but some progress with the commitment could still be supported with a reduced Ward Discretionary Budget.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Fewer community projects supported, or community projects funded at lower amounts.

Participatory Budgeting (PB) is underway in some Wards and to date has been successful in engaging members of the public in how best to deploy the grant. This would still be possible but at a much lower level. This method can support the community empowerment and localism agenda.

The removal of the youth discretionary grant means no further support for youth activities from this source is possible, unless it is considered through the remaining ward discretionary grant and/or in using PB where young people are encouraged to participate.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Potentially as some grant could support groups with protected characteristics e.g. young people, older people. In rural communities where there is no alternative funding for community projects (e.g. Common Good Fund or Community Benefit from renewable energy generation) the impact is likely to be greater as there is more reliance on the

	Council's discretionary grants.	
Mitigating action	Some funding still exists so continuing support is available, but at a lower level. Members could consider an alternative apportionment of the remaining grant, rather than it being allocated on a flat rate per Ward. For example factors such as rurality and deprivation could be factored in.	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		Yes
Potentially deprived area funds in some localities.		
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		Yes
Equalities Summary		
Screening undertaken, full EQIA required. EQIA complete, mitigation identified.		

Deliverability and Risks

The saving is achievable by reducing the budget at the start of the year.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/8
Activity Heading	Policy, Reform and Ward Management				
Savings Name	10% Reduction in administration grants for community councils				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.207m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

There are 154 Community Councils in Highland; at the time of writing 27 are yet to form. Community Councils receive annual grant funding from the Council to cover their administrative costs.

The amount paid is based on a formula that takes into account population and geography covered, with the current level set of a core award of £850 for rural Community Councils (population density of less than 8.8/sq. km.) and £750 for all others, plus 37p per elector in the Community Council area. Based on this formula the award varies from £850 to £3100 per annum for each Community Council. The current awards are based on the population estimates from 2010 as there has been no budget provision to increase the award as the population for Highland has risen (an increase of 12460 since 2010).

The proposal is to reduce the core amount and amount per elector by approximately 10% and to apply the most recent population figures. This would mean a core award of £765 for rural Community Councils and £675 for all others, plus 33p per elector in the Community Council area. The total budget required for all Community Councils would be £190,000, providing a saving of £17,000. Awards would range from £761 to £3101.

It is also proposed to confirm in the Community Council Scheme that: grant awards are for the administration expenses for the Community Council and not for other purposes; and that population adjustments will not be made during a Community Council term as there is no further budget provision.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.017	0
2017/18	0	0
2018/19	0	0
Total	0.017	0

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

There are no explicit programme commitments relating to Community Councils, but there are commitments in relation to strengthening local democracy. Community Councils have a statutory role within our democratic processes.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

1. Work has been carried out to identify the balances held by Community Councils. This shows that none of the Community Councils have fully used their grant in the last financial year. Annual financial returns from the Community Councils in operation at end March 2015 show they hold in total £986,613 in reserves.
2. Some of the funds held are restricted for particular purpose. Funds that are simply earmarked for a particular activity, where the Community Council might decide to spend the money on an alternative project, are not truly restricted. Analysis of the financial returns and Treasurers' reports plus feedback from the local liaison officers, estimates £59,363 of restricted funds are held by 14 Community Councils. If these are deducted from the total funds held, £927,250 is held in total. The average balance retained is £6,439. The median is £3,089 – this is the midpoint in the range of balances held so half held more than this and half held less than this. Only 7 Community Councils had retained balances of less than £500.
3. As the grant is for administrative purposes and it is not all currently used and because all

Community Councils show balances at the year end, there should be little if any impact on their performance by reducing the grant. Community Councils can continue to fund raise for other expenditure if they require it for other purposes.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)		No
If no, state why	The grant is for administrative purposes. Although it is being reduced, Community Councils should budget for their administration costs accordingly. The proposal will impact equally on urban and rural Community Councils.	
If YES, state why	Only 7 Community Councils had retained balances of less than £500 at 31.3.15 (5 of these are in Ward 11).	
Mitigating action		
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO) Potentially Ward Discretionary Funding reductions, as community councils are eligible to apply.		Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		NA
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.		

Deliverability and Risks

The grants for administration are made on receipt of accounts following their approval at their AGM. These are normally held in the summer. Early notice of the change in grant will enable Community Councils to plan their budget accordingly.

Community Councils with balances below £500 can be contacted by the local liaison officer to ensure that sufficient funds are held at 1.4.16 to enable the Community Council to function normally until the annual grant is processed. All Community Councils should be managing finances to adequately cover expenditure during this period. If insufficient funds were held this might indicate wider concerns in the operation of the Community Council.

Should some Community Councils not form, the grant would not be required so there would be scope for small additional grant to be paid to those in need on an exceptional and discretionary basis to ensure that a reduction in grant did not make any community council unviable.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/9
Activity Heading	Policy, Reform and Ward Management				
Savings Name	Delete posts				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.920m	Current Staffing (FTE)	15.8FTE		

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

Within the Ward Management staff team there are 3 x FTE operating in the senior team (with line management and ward management responsibilities), 9.8 x FTE Ward Managers, 2 x FTE Assistant Ward Managers and 1 support post attached to the Town House

The proposal is to:

1. Save £150,000 in Ward Management staffing by deleting up to 3 Ward Management posts.
2. Delete the support post attached to the Town House as the post is no longer required from 1.4.16 (£18k).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.168	4
2017/18	0	
2018/19	0	
Total	0.168	4

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

The Council has commitments relating to: strengthening local democracy; empowering communities; developing new local community planning arrangements and community resilience planning. A 20% reduction in the ward management team will mean reduced capacity to deliver on these commitments. The geographic areas covered by a smaller team will increase, some work will have to stop being done to focus on priority areas and other work will require longer timescales to complete.

The deletion of the support post will have no impact on the Council's programme.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There will be reduced capacity to deliver the programme commitments and to respond to requests for service from the public, Members, other Council services and partners.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The service can still continue with a reduced team, but its capacity to respond will be reduced. Service redesign will be required to identify how to deliver the function across all areas.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Not yet known
This will depend on the areas to lose a Ward Manager post and any other reduction in other Council posts and services in the same localities. The areas affected will not be known until the voluntary redundancy applications are approved and service reductions are confirmed.	
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

It is likely that the savings can be made through voluntary redundancy. The timing for any redundancy may be after 1.4.16 because of key duties required for elections. End dates may be end May 2016 at the earliest. This means the saving in 2016/17 may not be fully achieved.

There is a risk to the localism agenda if the posts are deleted. This can be mitigated to some extent by redesigning the ward management function and team, re-prioritising work and stopping some activities. Support would have to be re-prioritised to the local committees, the localism action plan and new legal duties arising from the Community Empowerment Act 2015. Expectations of the Ward Management team will have to change. Service redesign will be needed.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/10
Activity Heading	Policy, Reform and Ward Management				
Savings Name	Re-charge Common Good Fund for ward manager's time				
Current Budget (£m)	£0 - income	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

Ward Manager time to support Trustees with their role in administering Common Good Funds should be re-charged to the relevant funds. A review will identify where this is possible.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.002	0
2017/18	0	0
2018/19	0	0
Total	0.002	0

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

No impact

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The payment of fees will mean less funding for other purposes, but the amount involved is small and would be proportionate to the work carried out.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The amount in scope is small and proportionate to the service provided for Common Good Fund Administration.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Time recording is required to validate cost recovery.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office		
Activity Heading	Policy Reform and Ward Management		
Savings Name	Reduce Discretionary Spend for Gaelic arts development and events		
Current Budget (£m)	£0.220m	Current Staffing (FTE)	1FTE

Ref. CEO/11

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

The Council support Gaelic arts and culture through service delivery contracts totalling £205,971 p.a. for :

- An Comunn Gaidhealach - Royal National Mod (RNM) £40,000 p.a.
- Annual Blas Festival -£69,869
- Feisean nan Gaidheal - £37,794
- Feis Ross - £30,508
- UHI/Bursaries for UHI Gaelic Students -£2,500
- AAA/Gaelic Place Names - £4,000
- Comunn na Gaidhlig national primary schools football competition - £4000
- 0-3 years GLAIF project with CALA - £3300 (until 2017-18)
- FilmG – National pupils Film making Competition £1000

In addition there is £13,000 of uncommitted expenditure normally held as match funding for various projects that might arise in year (normally 20% contribution).

The proposal is to reduce the funding overall by 9% in each of 3 years (£19k). This could be shared across some or all of the contracts or be focused on one; although it is recommended that the Blas Festival is targeted for savings (see below).

Non recurring expenditure is also budgeted for; this is discretionary funding to cover events promotion. The proposal is to reduce this budget of £14,137 in 2016/17. This means removing the budget for weekly media reports and advertising (£1900) and removing the budget to support non-recurring or one-off events. In 2015/16 they included: the Celtic Media Festival (£5,000); Strath Gaelic choir (£500); Grantown Celebration (£500); Scottish Trads Hall of Fame (hosting £5737); and attendance at a Gaelic teachers conference (£500).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.033	0
2017/18	0.019	0
2018/19	0.019	0
Total	0.071	0

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

The Council has a commitment to supporting the statutory Gaelic Language Plan. Arts, media and heritage is one theme of the plan and economic development is another theme. The Council has a commitment on building tourism and working with partners to develop and retain world class events. A reduction in the funding for events will mean less support for events and thus limit the capacity to deliver the commitment.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This depends on how the £19k saving is taken. If Feisean nan Gaidheal and Feis Rois have reductions this will impact on learning programmes in the community. If events are targeted then their programmes may have to be reduced if alternative funding (e.g. through other funders or ticket sales)

are not available. **It is recommended that the reduction is made in funding for Blas over a three year period as it has the most potential to be commercially viable and attract alternative funding.**

The £14k of saving from non-recurring expenditure removes flexibility to meet one-off requests to support local groups and events.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes potentially
--	------------------------

If no, state why	
------------------	--

If YES, state why	The community learning programmes through Feisean nan Gaidheal and Feis Ross support young people in particular. A reduction in funding to them could reduce opportunities for them to participate in extracurricular cultural activities.
-------------------	--

Mitigating action	The 10% reduction per annum could be found from reducing support from the Blas festival. It would mean reducing funding to around £13,000 by year 3, but still provide a period of transition for the festival to find alternative sources of funding including increasing ticket prices.
-------------------	---

2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes potentially
---	------------------------

Savings proposed in music tuition in the C&L budget.	
--	--

3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
---	-----------

3A Equalities Summary
Screening undertaken, mitigation identified, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The £14k of discretionary funding can be removed from the budget at the start of the financial year.

The Service Delivery Contracts for An Comunn Gaidhealach - Royal National Mod (RNM), Annual Blas Festival, Feisean nan Gaidheal and Feis Ross require 6 months' written notice of a change in funding. The providers affected can be advised of the change in February and that 6 months' notice is not possible or that payments can be made quarterly rather than annually with the reduced payments affecting quarters 3 and 4 to enable a transition to reduced funding within the organisation.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/12
Activity Heading	Policy, Reform and Ward Management				
Savings Name	Policy team staff reduction and reduce discretionary spending on mental health events				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.065m	Current Staffing (FTE)	2.8FTE		

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

To delete a vacant post (0.8 FTE) of Policy Co-ordinator - £25,000

To remove discretionary funding for:

- The annual Scottish Mental Health Arts and Film Festival - £11k
- NHH to support awareness raising around suicide prevention £20k

The remaining funding for mental health is £8,600 in grants to the Samaritans (Inverness - £5000 and Caithness £3600).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.056	0.8
2017/18	0	0
2018/19	0	0
Total	0.056	0.8

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

The Council has a commitment in the programme on promoting mental health and reducing stigma associated with mental ill health, with a focus on young people. The performance measures all relate to activity in the Care and Learning Service and this is not affected by the savings proposed from the policy team budget.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The reduction of a post reduces the policy team from 2.8 FTE to 2 staff members. This means stopping some activities (running the communities panel, analysis on the care and learning lifestyle survey, policy work on health improvement including support for the mental health and arts film festival, promoting and supporting the Credit Union, community benefits from the ICT contract and any service specific evaluations). It also means scaling back on other activities, especially advice to services on consultation and engagement methods (in the past 12 months this has included service points consultation – survey + focus groups; transport consultation – survey + public engagement events x 15; website satisfaction survey; Invergordon community event on community benefit and advice on Inverness arts and culture survey). There will be reduced or no capacity to respond to any new requests for policy support.

Mental health arts and film festival – the Council funds the launch event each year and supports various programmed events. If alternative funding was not found by the groups involved the programme would be reduced, but the festival could still run. The Council did not fund the films shown for example.

It is difficult to know the impact of removing the funding to NHH for suicide prevention as at the time of writing information on the total programme run by NHH and the number of people receiving the training has not been provided. Previously the Council funding paid for administering the events and venue hire costs and we believe these costs could be absorbed in NHH and supported in kind by the Council through the use of Council premises for running events. We can mitigate any negative impacts by discussing with the Samaritans how future support can be provided to the programme of suicide training and awareness.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
--	------------

If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The reduced funding for mental health events could have a negative impact on those affected by mental ill health.
Mitigating action	The mental health arts and film festival could still be run without Council support, but scaled back if no other funding is available. A programme of suicide awareness raising and prevention should still be run by NHSH as the Council's contribution only covered some costs. We can discuss with the Samaritans how they may support the awareness raising events through the grant we provide.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	Yes
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, full EQIA required on reduction to mental health spending. EQIA complete and potential mitigation identified.	

Deliverability and Risks

The saving would be made at the start of the year so it is achievable.

A smaller team (of 2) providing policy advice means less advice is provided with some current activities stopping and others scaled back (as described above).

There will be disappointment among groups supporting people with mental ill health in the reduction in funding, but the funding is discretionary and not statutory. Early notice of withdrawal of funding should be provided. The Arts and Film Festival should still run although with potentially a reduced programme.

NHSH have been asked to confirm how many suicide awareness raising and training events were run and how many people participated in the last year, but with the Council's contribution of funding withdrawn the programme should still run, potentially with fewer sessions. We can support the sessions in other ways e.g. offering Council premises as venues at no cost and making links with the funding we provide to the Samaritans.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/13
Activity Heading	Policy Reform and Ward Management				
Savings Name	Highland Environmental Network contract and Carbon Clever publicity and events				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.012m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

The climate change team has a discretionary budget of £12,500 to promote the carbon Clever initiative. Currently that is used in a contract with the Highland Environmental Network (£7.5k) and for publicity and advertising (£5k). It is proposed to terminate the contract and reduce the funding for other promotional activity.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.010	0
2017/18	0	0
2018/19	0	0
Total	0.010	0

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

The Council has a commitment in the Programme to support communities to reduce their carbon emissions. Promotional activity will be reduced.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Promotional activity will have to be run in-house and mostly through the website and social media. It is unlikely to have the same reach as the Highland Environmental Network.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	In-house provision can be used instead, although it will have less reach.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
The 50% reduction in capital funding for carbon clever projects will affect the amount of funding available to support communities with their projects.	
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The budget can be reduced at the start of the financial year.

The provider has already been notified that the current contract, due to end 31.3.16, is unlikely to be renewed.

Budget Template

Service	Chief Executive's Office			Ref.	CEO/14
Activity Heading	Corporate Communications				
Savings Name	Restructuring				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.168m	Current Staffing (FTE)	5.6 FTE		

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

Release of 2 posts (1.8 FTE) and recruitment of Digital Communications Assistant post (0.6 FTE)

Post	Grade	SCP	fte	Total budget
Graphic Designer	HC6	SCP28	0.8	24,715
Public Relations Assistant	HC5	SCP23	1.0	<u>27,183</u>
				51,898
Digital Communications Assistant	HC6	SCP24	0.6	16,153
Total Savings				35,745

A Digital communications assistant with graphic design, communications and social media skills would increase resilience and capacity in the reduced team, allowing total savings of £35,745.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.036	1.2
2017/18	0	0
2018/19	0	0
Total	0.036	1.2

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

Maintaining resilience and capacity in corporate communications is essential in order to support the council's programme and the Council's Corporate Communications Strategy.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The loss of the Communications Assistant post will reduce the capacity to provide media monitoring and a responsive media service. The loss of a graphic designer will reduce the capacity to provide graphic design services across the council to the current level and therefore prioritisation will need to be done.
Mitigating action	Recruitment of a Digital Communications Assistant will enable resilience in graphic design and media response capacity and will provide some holiday/absence cover, whilst still releasing significant savings.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The savings are known to be deliverable.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/2
Activity Heading	Public Conveniences				
Savings Name	Review of Provision of Public Conveniences				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.233m	Current Staffing (FTE)	1		

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

95 Public Conveniences (PC) and 22 HCS scheme toilets are open and in use 2015/16:

- Close 6 public conveniences in the centres of each of: Inverness; Dingwall; Nairn; Fort William; Wick; Thurso; and amend operation of Aviemore.

0.277
- Retain 44 of the remaining 88 sites. These will be higher use or strategic tourism sites with no local alternative; some could be closed and replaced with HCS or transferred to Communities.
Close the remaining 44 sites with an offer of negotiated transfer to community groups or businesses with no HCS contribution. No residual cost to Council upon disposal of sites.

0.272
- Introduce honesty boxes throughout with 20p recommended contribution.

0.075
- Contractors redundancy attributable to the Council for staff originally TUPE'd approximately 16 FTE staff.

-0.030 (TBC)

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.250	0
2017/18	0.344	0
2018/19		
Total	0.594	0

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

Highland First Item 28 Tourism: Lack of public convenience facilities may have a negative impact on tourism and by focussing on retaining higher use or strategic tourism sites with no local alternative it is hoped that the impact will be low.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No change.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	<p>PC's attract people and thus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Businesses taking on a Highland Comfort Scheme toilet may attract more business. 2. Businesses may suffer where a PC is closed and there is no alternative. 3. Closure of some sites will remove disabled and baby changing facilities which would have a potential adverse impact on these user groups 4. There would be fewer across Highland however the potential impact in rural areas given the lack of alternative facilities would be greater.

Mitigating action	The Highland Comfort Scheme will be promoted in place of closed facilities. Focus on retaining strategic tourism sites with no local alternative.	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		Yes
Equalities Summary EQIA completed, mitigation identified.		

Deliverability and Risks

Proposals for closures will be made by officers and need to be agreed with Members.

Risks:

- Closures will not be popular and may prove difficult to deliver;
- Potential for public health risk at remote sites
- Some people with health or disability needs plan their journeys around availability of toilets for the disabled.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/4
Activity Heading	Coast Protection				
Savings Name	Delete the Coast Protection maintenance budget				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.057m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

Delete the £57k Coast Protection budget used to carry out maintenance works on formal coast protection defence measures installed by the Council. The budget works often require special equipment and contractors and, in any case, major works will require considerably more than £57k.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.057	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.057	0

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

Stewardship of infrastructure is reduced.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No change

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Lack of maintenance of coast protection works will ultimately increase the risk to coastal communities of tidal flooding.
Mitigating action	Fund major repairs from capital.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities Summary	
Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.	

Deliverability and Risks

The saving is easily deliverable and major repairs will have to be funded from capital.

Risks are that:

- Lack of maintenance of coast protection works will ultimately increase the risk to coastal communities of tidal flooding. Without any maintenance the defence structures will deteriorate and become less effective.
- Single storms can result in substantial repair work requirement.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/5
Activity Heading	Recycling Centres				
Savings Name	Review opening hours				
Current Budget (£m)	£9.995m	Current Staffing (FTE)	80		

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

The Council has a network of 21 Recycling Centres across Highland with varying services. However they all permit the disposal of residual waste. Those in the urban centres offer the most services for recycling.

The proposal is to reduce the hours of opening at Recycling Centres that currently open for 6 or 7 days per week. This will necessitate operating on a standard 5-day week covering from Thursday to Monday (closed Tuesday/Wednesday) in RCs except:

1. Inverness – reduced daily opening hours only;
2. RCs linked to waste transfer stations/landfill sites; and
3. RCs which open for less than 6 days per week.

Financial Year 2016/17 reflects savings from reduced opening hours.

There would be no staff savings, only on the overtime budget

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.081	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.081	0

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Service Level: Householders - reduced opportunity to dispose of recyclables and residual/bulky waste.
Commercial customers - reduced opportunity for our commercial customers to deposit excess recyclables.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Will reduce the opportunity of householders to take excess waste to Recycling Centres when most convenient for some of them to do so. Will also reduce the opportunity for our commercial customers to deposit recycle.
Mitigating action	The Recycling Centres will be open perhaps not exactly when a proportion of the population wish to use them.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Delivery will depend on successfully negotiating the position with the TUs. The saving is reliant on successfully changing the terms and conditions for the existing recycling centre employees.

Risks: there is the possibility of an increase in fly-tipping and recycling rate reduction. Potential loss of commercial customers and therefore income. If the changes were made in mid contract (skip servicing) then there may well be a compensatory claim made by the contractor.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/6
Activity Heading	Street Cleansing				
Savings Name	Reduction in Service				
Current Budget (£m)	£2.871m	Current Staffing (FTE)	70		

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

This proposal is to continue the reduction in staffing to this statutory service of 5 posts in each of the three years to 2019.

This will have an effect on the Council's ability to deliver its statutory requirement to keep streets, including the Trunk Roads, clean. This does not simply mean the absence of litter but also of detritus and all other materials that accumulates on the roads/pavements.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.100	5
2017/18	0.100	5
2018/19	0.100	5
Total	0.300	15

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Service Level: Statutory service reduction will make it more difficult to meet statutory requirements and will result in lower service standard.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	It may impact on tourism. There will be impact across the Highland area.
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability: TU consultation and agreement will be necessary.

Risks: Reduction in street cleanliness leading to a lower cleanliness score in our annual audit. Possibility of not meeting our statutory duty to keep roads clean.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		Ref.	CS/10
Activity Heading	Airstrips			
Savings Name	Airstrips Operation and Maintenance			
Current Budget (£m)	£0.028m	Current Staffing (FTE)	9	

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

The Council operates and maintains airstrips at Ashaig (near Broadford), Plockton and Dornoch.

The proposal is to:

- Cease operation and maintenance of Plockton and Dornoch and explore and encourage community operation.
- Explore options for the future commercial operation of Ashaig Airstrip by others as soon as possible in 2016. The Council does not have sufficient resource to operate the airstrip commercially.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.028	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.028	0

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

None.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

None.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Light plane users may be restricted in being able to land and take off and any economic benefit to the locality lost.
Mitigating action	Encourage communities or commercial operation of the airstrips
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Relatively easy to realise the net saving stated if operation and maintenance ceases, however there is likely to be opposition, especially at Ashaig, although this saving may provide a catalyst to others to take on the responsibility for them.

Ashaig Airstrip is subject to proposals for provision of future commercial services and consideration of the proper operation of the facility is necessary before expanding its use.

Although 9 FTE are variously involved the total input is not sufficient to identify a single FTE saving.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/11
Activity Heading	Grounds Maintenance				
Savings Name	Play Areas				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.342m	Current Staffing (FTE)	4		

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

The Council currently maintains 300 Play Areas at an annual cost of £342,115. This is a non-statutory function. The savings proposal is for the Council to cease maintaining some of the Play Areas by either transferring them to Community Groups or closure. The Play Areas which are to be considered for transfer/closure fall into the following categories:

- Smaller residential sites/ attached to Housing Estates/ reasonably close to a larger play facility
- 'Redundant Sites' – end of life site/ low usage/ sites with vandalism or anti-social behaviour problems.

Play Areas which are 'Key' Sites [central/large/destination] will be retained.

It is estimated that this could achieve a third of the budget in savings and potentially 1 or 2 FTEs which will be finalised when the categorisation of sites is completed (currently being undertaken by Area Teams).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.112	1 or 2
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.112	1 or 2

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

No Impact

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

None - no current targets.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	There is a potential for impact on young people in some communities. There is a potential rural impact as closure may affect the only facility in the community.
Mitigating action	An assessment to determine which play facilities may close or transfer to communities will be based on the availability of alternative provision. Play Facilities may be available in local primary school / Academy. The same criteria will be used across Highland therefore limiting the potential impact on rural areas. Communities will be encouraged to take over play areas where appropriate thereby further mitigating the potential impact upon a community. Local consultation will be undertaken with the communities affected
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, mitigation identified. Full EQIA not required at this stage but will be undertaken when facilities are identified.

Deliverability and Risks

Transfer of Sites - subject to successful consultation with communities

Mitigating action - subject to consultation with Schools/ Care & Learning.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/12
Activity Heading	Interments				
Savings Name	Interments to take place within 7 days unless there are traditional or religious reasons for not doing so				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.152m	Current Staffing (FTE)	35		

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

It is a current expectation in the Highlands, especially rural areas, to inter the deceased within 3 to 4 days, from the initial request for burial. By extending this period to 7 days, Council could potentially save on burial operatives work.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.044	2
2017/18	0.044	2
2018/19		
Total	0.088	4

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

There is currently no maximum period stipulated within the current Council burial policy/ rules for an interment to take place following initial request.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The average period taken to complete a burial after booking will increase although this is not expected to be significant as burials will always be prioritised over other work.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Extended waiting period for families to bury a loved one.
Mitigating action	The 7 day period would be stipulated as a maximum period and every attempt would be made to provide the service in a shorter time period. A shorter period would be facilitated where traditional or religious reasons apply.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, mitigation identified. Full impact assessment not required.	

Deliverability and Risks

This saving is deliverable but is a particularly sensitive proposal – especially for rural Highland. Special care will need to be taken in localities where undertakers have no appropriate cooling facilities to keep the deceased prior to burial.

Main risk is not meeting the 7 day maximum deadline but full time Burial Operatives would be augmented in busy times by other Grounds/Roads Operatives.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/13
Activity Heading	Out of Hour Call Handling				
Savings Name	Out of Hours				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.100m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

Change of 'out of hours' call handling service from Police Scotland to Aberdeen City Council. This change is as a result of:

- (1) Affordability
- (2) Police Scotland moving the service from Inverness to central Scotland

The Service has robust processes set up to enable a third party to deliver this function, and Aberdeen City Council is experienced in delivering out of hours to their own tenants and those of Aberdeenshire Council. There are no negative implications for the tenants of Highland Council.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.015	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.015	0

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

No impact on programme.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No impact

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	This is a back office change that will not be visible to tenants.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Saving achieved already in 2015/16. Budget to be removed in 2016/17.

The change involves training staff in Aberdeen City Council repairs service. This is not considered a risk as they provide this service already for their own tenants and are familiar with out of hours repairs processes. IT systems are compatible and no risks have been identified at this time.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/16
Activity Heading	Service Standby Budgets				
Savings Name	Standby Review				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.680m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

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

A review of the Roads & Community Works and Street Lighting budgets has identified a total saving in standby of £86,644 (12.75%). This sum can be achieved through a series of exercises:

- Out of hours (all year) response team reduce to 4 operatives across Highland & introduce an up to 3 hours response time to reported incidents. Supervisory duty officer costs will only cover 1 post Highland wide**.
- Winter Maintenance Arrangements – Reduce to 4 duty officers (including **) across Highland operating for the 22 week winter period (some provision has been allowed for fringe weeks).
- Winter Maintenance Morning Controllers weekends & bank holidays – reduce to 4 Highland-wide.
- Street Lighting Team will reduce to a smaller contingent having 2xElectricians on standby in the Inner Moray Firth and others across Highland taking part in the Service Duty Officer rota for the equivalent of 1/5th of a person in 2 rotas.
- The current standby paid to Lighting Engineers will cease.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.087	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.087	0

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

No impact

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There will be an adverse impact to the time taken to respond to some emergencies depending on the location of resources and the distance from the incident locality. However there are currently no response targets set.

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Service users & stakeholders (Police) as reduced operational resource available across Highland out of hours to provide response to road traffic or other incidents leading to longer response times (up to 3 hours). Impact is equal across Highland.
Mitigating action	Follow HR advice and appropriate Council procedures. Communicate to public & partners to highlight reduced capacity and increase in service response time to incidents involving attendance by operatives out with normal operational hours.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers?	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected?	No
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.	

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability dependent on:

Successful consultation Trade Unions & staff;

New software being in place with training provided;

Development of new/clear guidance, access to route info and training for Duty Officers and Morning Control teams;

Updated process map for service response to and definitions of out of hours emergency for Service Centre;

Negotiations with Police and as relevant other agencies in relation to the 3 hours response time;

Development of rota open to all current participants for the emergency contacts service (outwith winter duty) to support & direct as required the Service Centre and 4x24hr operatives team.

Risks

Fewer local duty officers – reduction in available local knowledge base;

Engagement with service stakeholders not well received/accepted;

Larger geographical areas may affect the normal role of the duty officers in terms of their daily duties/tasks

Stress levels may be higher

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/17
Activity Heading	Anti-Social Behaviour				
Savings Name	Review Antisocial Behaviour Services				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.324m	Current Staffing (FTE)	11		

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

At present there are 11 (fte) staff who are 100% funded from the non-HRA, delivering a range of services aimed at reducing antisocial behaviour. A saving of £162,000 can be achieved by transferring 50% of the funding for these staff to the HRA with no reduction in overall staff numbers. An analysis of current workloads indicates that a significant proportion of time is spent delivering low level housing management services associated with council housing estates, and therefore it is appropriate to fund part of the service from the HRA. This proposal has been budgeted within HRA revenue estimates for 2016/17.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.162	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.162	0

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

No impact.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No impact.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No change
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

None.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/18
Activity Heading	Social Enterprises				
Savings Name	Negotiate to remove all funding from Social Enterprises				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.350m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

The proposal is to bring forward the removal of payments to Social Enterprises for materials which we collect and they collect from Recycling Centres and refurbish for re-use. It was envisaged some years ago when the SEs would become self-sustaining and carry on the work without payment – the date mooted at the time was 2020. The Council has had a decade long relationship with a number of Social Enterprises (including Blythswood and Newstart). They continue to receive waste from Council sites for re-use and are duly paid a fee for this activity. However since the peak of funding of around £1M/yr this has been reduced gradually over the years to the current sum.

The saving in its totality is dependent on the SEs continuing to require the materials from the Recycling Centres thereby maintaining the service at current levels. However if this was not the case then removal of payments would reduce the opportunities for the Council to divert waste to re-use activities thereby increasing the tonnage to landfill (and associated costs) and a reduction of our recycling rate.

If the Social Enterprises declined to accept the material without cost then some or all of the material may have to be landfilled if no other provider could be found to take the materials at no cost.

An alternative strategy could be to offer materials for re-use through an open tendering process – seeking the lowest cost solution (and preferably zero) but in any event a cost base no greater than the equivalent landfill cost for disposal. However the only option to save all 350k would be a zero payment solution for the materials offered and duly taken and refurbished.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.250	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.250	0

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Potential for recycling rate to reduce if some or all of the material is diverted to landfill.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Some of the employees of the Social Enterprises will be disabled/hard to employ and removal of funding may affect their ability to retain all of the staff.
Mitigating action	In 2015/16 a framework agreement was introduced with one of the Social Enterprises impacted for the supply of re-used goods. This supports local employment and volunteering within these organisations and may in part assist in mitigating the impact of the proposal.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No

3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, impact identified and limited potential mitigation. Full EQIA not required.	

Deliverability and Risks Deliverability: We can cease joint operations quickly but we will have to re-engineer internal operations to take account of the increased waste for disposal. Risks: Reputational risk for the Council. Potential decrease in recycling rate.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/21
Activity Heading	Service Management				
Savings Name	Review layers of management throughout Service				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.650m	Current Staffing (FTE)	8		

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

A full review of the current structure of Community Services. Proposal to move from the current 8 SMT structure to a 4 Heads of Service structure. A report to go to Community Services committee in February 2016 showing the full structure proposals and how this impacts on localism and service delivery.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.300	4
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.300	4

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

No impact

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No impact

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Decisions reached at Community Services committee in February may lessen the ability to achieve full year savings.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/24
Activity Heading	Supporting People				
Savings Name	Reduce budget for homelessness housing support services				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.689m	Current Staffing (FTE)	6		

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

This would result in cutting the budget by a fixed 5%. This would reduce the number of hours of housing support being provided to homeless clients and people at risk of homelessness.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.082	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.082	0

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

Could have a negative impact on number 49 – poverty and deprivation. The proposal may impact on the viability of existing housing support providers.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This will involve commissioning fewer hours of housing support each week under existing housing support contracts with 7 external housing support providers. (On current rates this would result in a reduction of around 90 hours of housing support being provided each week)

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	There will be fewer hours of housing support delivered to homeless clients, this may include young women, men, and people affected by disability and health issues including mental health conditions.
Mitigating action	This proposal will result in a reduction in service. This can be partly mitigated by prioritising available support to those clients in greatest need. To support this a review on the service is being undertaken which will consider: a) our statutory duty to assess housing support needs and provide access to housing support for all homeless and potentially homeless people in need of it; b) Develop a housing support service tailored to meet the individual needs of homeless people; c) Implement greater focus on outcomes and monitoring the success of housing support interventions; d) Provide access to Housing Support across all areas of the Highlands including rural communities;
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Not known
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	Yes for the review

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken. Potential negative impact noted, mitigation identified, including a full EQIA of the policy

review.

Deliverability and Risks

This will require a formal amendment to contract for existing housing support providers – requiring a 3 month notice period.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/25
Activity Heading	Street Cleansing				
Savings Name	Stop Buying Dog Bags				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.010m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

The Council has for many years bought and distributed dog waste bags across Highland, both through Council offices and through dispensers at discrete locations.

Dog bags are widely available in many retail outlets and the proposal is to stop the free distribution of dog bags to the public.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.010	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.010	0

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability would be straight forward.

Risks: Most people who use our dog bags will presumably be sufficiently responsible to purchase their own so there would be a small risk of an increase in dog fouling associated with this proposal.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/26
Activity Heading	Recycling				
Savings Name	Cut in Waste Awareness Budget				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.075m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

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

This saving is simply a reduction in budget.

The budget is used to fund bin permits, leaflets, newsletters and for commercial customer contract info, promotion and advice of service change (e.g. green waste collections), stand fees (Black Isle show etc) etc. It is also used for dog enforcement promotions.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.040	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.040	0

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Reduced messaging/ visibility may lead to reduced quality/ quantity of recyclables and reduced ability to run environmental improvement campaigns – dogs/fly-tipping/chewing gum/littering etc. Reduced ability to promote service changes.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Reduced information to households and the public in general will make them less informed.
Mitigating action	None
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverability – simple removal of budget.

Risks – reduced ability to inform, educate and promote positive behavioural change in the community. Less able to properly promote service change and local initiatives. Potential for reduced quality and quantity of recyclables.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref. CS/27
Activity Heading	Community Transport			
Savings Name	Review funding to community groups			
Current Budget (£m)	£0.417m	Current Staffing (FTE)	This is not a staff budget	

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

Saving mechanism already approved by Community Services Committee 5 November decision on Item 13 – Report COM 60/15.

Saving already agreed - budget to be removed in 2016/17.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.040	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.040	0

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The annual level of available funding is lower which may put pressure on some project proposal delivery intentions where groups have not been awarded the full amount they sought. An equality assessment identified the potential for impact because of: age; disability; race and socioeconomic status. More positively, grant awards have been approved for five new applicants enabling better financial security for their activities to benefit their communities.
Mitigating action	Awards were decided by Community Services Committee on 4 February 2016. Rural and equality impact assessments informed the grant process which included specific assessment criteria, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit to the community or specific group within the community. • Promoting a fairer, more inclusive Highland. Twenty-four applicants (two more than currently supported) have been awarded some level of funding, although in some cases this may be lower than previously. Only 5 previous applicants did not apply, all bar one was anticipated.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	Yes

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken. Full impact assessment undertaken. Mitigation identified.

Deliverability and Risks

This needs to be considered in the wider context of the challenging savings target already in place for public and school transport (£2.246M (15%) over 4 years).

Budget Template

Service	Community Services		
Activity Heading	Burials and Cremations		
Savings Name	Increase Interment Charges		
Current Budget (£m)	£0.152m	Current Staffing (FTE)	106

Ref. CS/28

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

2 Year Option

Bring forward the increases in burials, cremation and lair charges scheduled for the next 3 years into 2016/17 with inflation in from 2017/18 and thereafter. Savings modelling is based on the parameters below and will provide a net increase over the saving agreed in December 2014 of £0.099m and more importantly draw forward £0.633m to 2016/17. Assuming that other Council's rates increase by 2.5% pa the proposal would put Highland in the top quartile of Scotland in 16/17

Charges would increase from :

- Burials from £638 in 15/16 to £970 in 16/17.
- Cremations from £638 in 15/16 to £849 in 16/17.
- Lair purchase from £ 566 in 15/16 to £753 in 16/17.

There are approximately 1,600 burials, 1,000 cremations and 1,100 lair purchases per annum.

****The proposal will replace those in savings CS7a, b, c & d as approved by Full Council in Dec 2014.**

Financial Year	Saving agreed Dec 2014 £m	Accelerated Saving ** £m	Net Saving change over Dec 2104 £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.288	0.921	0.633	0
2017/18	0.316	0.064	-0.252	0
2018/19	0.347	0.065	-0.282	0
Total	0.951	1.050	0.099	0

Impact on Council Programme (please state if any)

No impact

Impact on Service Performance (eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)

No impact

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Some people on lower incomes will find the increase difficult to pay with a risk of more people on financial assistance from the Social Fund.
Mitigating action	Work with industry to provide clear publicity to signpost other support for those families that need help. A leaflet detailing help available for families with funeral costs has been produced by the Council and distributed to funeral directors. Note that the overall cost to the family of a cremation has reduced in 2015/16 by the removal of state medical references charges of £150 which was additional to the cremation charge.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Increase in risk that a proportion of the population will find the increases difficult to pay.

Likelihood of adverse publicity especially from religious and pensioner bodies.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/30
Activity Heading	Environmental Health – contaminated land team				
Savings Name	Reduction of contaminated land team to a core of staff that will concentrate on development control work.				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.206m	Current Staffing (FTE)	4.91		

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

The Council's statutory duty on contaminated land is addressed in two ways:

1. Proactive investigation of sites that may have been contaminated by historic use;
2. Use of the development control process to ensure that potentially contaminated sites are made suitable for use.

In line with other Councils in Scotland, the team have already started to focus on method 2. (Development control) as the key process to ensure potentially contaminated land is assessed and, where appropriate, remediated.

The team currently comprises 3.91 x Scientific Officers (HC9) and 1 x information technician (HC6).

The proposal is to reduce the team by 2.0 x Scientific Officers (HC9). The remaining officers will concentrate on development control work.

2.0 x Scientific Officers (HC9) are completing academic and professional training to become Environmental Health Officers. The wider environmental health team are currently restructuring through an approved workforce plan (EHWFP) which includes backfilling to ensure service delivery. To achieve the savings EHO posts will be created through amending the approved EHWFP backfilling proposals (neutral budget implication). The Student EHO policy allows the officers to transfer into these vacancies to complete their training. The officer's Scientific Officer posts will then be deleted.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.089	2.0
2017/18	0	0
2018/19	0	0
Total	0.089	2.0

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The impact on contaminated land service delivery is unlikely to be significant as priorities can be managed.

The impact on the EHWFP and wider Environmental Health service delivery may be more significant as available resources will alter. Careful management and prioritisation will be required to ensure continued delivery of duties such as food safety inspections.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The proposed changes will not lead to impact on developers.
If YES, state why	

Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.	

<p>Deliverability and Risks</p> <p>Deliverability subject to staff and trade union consultation.</p> <p>Risks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk to delivery of key duties such as food safety inspections as the EHWFP approved backfilling would be changed. This could be managed short-term given officers existing skills but will be challenging to maintain EH service delivery. 2. Risk to delivery of key duties such as food safety inspections in certain locations as Trainee EHOs are currently based in Inverness. This could be managed through EHWFP process and flexibility of allocation of work. 3. Risk to delays in development control process due to increased pressure on remaining 1.91fte SOs. This could be managed as officers being redeployed will still be available to assist remaining SO officers.

Budget Template

Service	Community Services			Ref.	CS/31
Activity Heading	Emergency Planning				
Savings Name	Emergency Planning Team				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.190m	Current Staffing (FTE)	4		

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

Reduce the Council's Emergency Planning staffing by 1 FTE.
There are significant implications for the delivery of Emergency Planning functions as highlighted in the Deliverability and Risks section below.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.035	1
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.035	1

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

There is a commitment in the programme to support community resilience planning. A reduction in the team will reduce the capacity to deliver this commitment.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The impact of the saving will be to reduce the resilience of the Council management to coordinate and react appropriately in emergency incident situations. The scale of the impact will vary depending on the nature of the emergency and in particular the duration of the particular situation.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	There is no direct impact on Council residents and businesses. As is the case currently individual incidents will affect sets of people.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
3. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO) 3 Ward Manager posts proposed for deletion as a saving (CEO/9). They attend Emergency Liaison Groups during an emergency planning event and support community resilience planning.	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Staff change can be achieved although 1 post out of 3 will need to be deleted and workload redistributed and reduced.

High risk that the Council's resilience to emergency situations is adversely impacted.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/AD/1
Activity Heading	Monitoring Adult Social Care service				
Savings Name	Commissioning Officer				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.090m	Current Staffing (FTE)	2		

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

When Adult and Childrens services integrated in 2012, two Commissioning Officer posts were established. One post is vacant. It is proposed to delete this post. The work will be covered by the remaining Commissioning Officer and Head of Service.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.045	1
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.045	1

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

None.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

It is believed that the monitoring of adult services and 3rd sector agencies can be achieved with the remaining resource.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	No- the role involves monitoring commissioned adult social care rather than front line service provision
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This can be delivered as post is vacant

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/AD/2
Activity Heading	External Funding monitoring				
Savings Name	External Funding Manager				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.046	Current Staffing (FTE)	1		

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

Deletion of External Funding Manager post. The post holder retired recently and the post is currently vacant. The post involves monitoring council grants and service delivery to a range of voluntary organisations including Eden Court, swimming pools run by voluntary organisations, sports and arts organisations and village halls. The duties are currently being undertaken by the Head of Service and the Commissioning Officer. The budget to the voluntary organisations will be considerably reduced in future years.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.046	1
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.046	1

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

It is believed that the monitoring and engagement with 3rd sector agencies can be achieved with the remaining resource, albeit there will be challenges at periods of increased activity – for example, reviewing delivery contracts and/or overseeing budget changes.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Less officer time to devote to communities and offer advice re funding opportunities. The voluntary groups are looking for advice on a regular basis.
Mitigating action	The commissioning officer is undertaking this role and building up relationships with the voluntary groups
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This can be delivered as the post is vacant. There will be greater risk at periods of increased activity – for example, reviewing delivery contracts and/or overseeing budget changes. This could include concern from 3rd sector organisations if they do not feel supported.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/AD/3
Activity Heading	Supported employment for blind and visually impaired people				
Savings Name	Blindcraft – reduce funding				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.057m	Current Staffing (FTE)			

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

Saving based upon 6% reduction.

Blindcraft provide employment and training for blind and visually impaired people. They also offer employment/training for people with other disabilities. They train people to move on to other employment and employ others to manufacture beds and other goods to sell to the public.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.003	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.003	

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

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Blindcraft will require to seek funding from another source or increase sales to maintain the same level of service.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	This measure will impact on an organisation that employs blind and visually impaired people.
Mitigating action	Modest reduction in funding only
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, and impact identified, but the amount of reduction is not considered to be a significant risk for the organisation

Deliverability and Risks

Blindcraft should be able to cope with the budget reduction in the first year but will require to resource other funding, or make other adjustments to their budget model to continue operating in the second year.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/AD/5&6
Activity Heading	Preventative Health Services				
Savings Name	Community Health Co coordinators and Community Food and Health Practitioners				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.240m plus £0.200m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Staff employed by NHS Highland		

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

Funding was provided to NHS Highland to employ Community Health Co coordinators in Wick, Alness, Merkinch and Fort William. The staff have been involved in:

- Local capacity building
- Delivery of healthy weight training
- Facilitation of Council Community empowerment workshops
- Development of social media
- Development of the local professional network
- Delivery of workshops to tackle self-harm and mental health stigma with young people
- Local capacity building to support social enterprise
- Facilitated meetings/workshops to bring people and organisations/groups that have not worked together previously to plan joint activity

The Community and Food Practitioners are based in Wick, Thurso, Alness, the East Ross seaboard villages and parts of Inverness. Their aim is to increase access to and availability of healthy affordable food. This involves supporting uptake of the Healthy Start Scheme, local food and retailer mapping, increase in food provision for older people. They also aim to increase the numbers of people who are eating a healthy diet and are physically active.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.440	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.440	

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

This will impact significantly on capacity to work with NHS Highland to encourage and support communities to deliver more social care services and facilitate community led good practice; and on work with partners to maximise the use of collective resources to achieve best outcomes.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The staff are not employed by the Council but the reduction of funding will mean less capacity in local communities in Wick, Alness, Fort William and Merkinch

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	

If YES, state why	In the identified communities	
Mitigating action		
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		Yes
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, full EQIA required in partnership with NHS Highland.		

Deliverability and Risks

The staff are not employed by the council. There will be impact in terms of ongoing work with these communities.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	High Life Highland and Inverness Leisure Funding		
Savings Name	4.3% savings target		
Current Budget (£m)	£12.9m	Current Staffing (FTE)	498

Ref. C&L/AD/7

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

It is proposed to apply a 4.3% saving to the funding provided to HLH and Inverness Leisure, albeit the overall savings required are far greater because of associated pressures.

This level of saving represents the reduction in Council grant funding from Scottish Government, and is therefore consistent with the overall level of reduction faced by the Council.

HLH would be expected to meet the additional budget pressures such as pay awards, inflation, etc from within their budget funding, after the 4.3% is applied. Accordingly, the overall level of saving that requires to be achieved is higher in real terms (estimated to be equivalent to £1.3m).

The savings are for the HLH Board [following the transfer of business from Inverness Leisure to HLH on 1st April 2016] to achieve within its management and governance processes.

The HLH proposals take an ambitious and challenging approach to income. Together with efficiencies, they seek to minimise reductions to services.

There is a risk that the savings targets will not be met, but based on the track record to date it is believed that this approach is appropriate and the risks manageable. Emergency in-year contingencies may be required if targets slip. Measures to reduce the impact of service reductions will also be pursued.

The proposals involve:

- New income and price increases: £530,000
- Management savings: £100,000
- Efficiencies from amalgamation: £200,000
- Inverness Traditional Music Co-ordinator: £15,000
- Adult Learning: £180,000
- Review of leisure facility opening hours: £75,000
- Review of arts projects: £50,000
- Review of youth projects: £150,000

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.325	-
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.325	-

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

The impact of the budget reduction would be for High Life Highland to manage, and they have been able to do this through efficiencies in the past, without significant negative impact on service delivery. The scale of these savings is greater, and service efficiency would remain the first intention, including as a consequence of an amalgamated organisation, but there will also require to be some managed service reductions.

Impact on Service Performance (eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)

Outcomes measures for Adult Learning contacts, youth work participants and arts attendances are likely to decrease.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications (please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)		Yes
If no, state why		
If YES, state why	Service reductions in adult learning, youth work and leisure facilities prices and opening times	
Mitigating action	Further focus on the securing of additional income - earned, donations and externally funded	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, ESOL and ABE are protected, and full EQIA not required.

Deliverability and Risks

There could be reduced customer numbers, membership and therefore income. There is also a risk that staffing efficiencies in Libraries might start to have an impact on customer numbers. In addition, management capacity is stretched, and these changes present further challenge.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/AD/9
Activity Heading	Eden Court Funding				
Savings Name	10% saving target for Eden Court				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.593m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

It is proposed to apply a 10% saving to the revenue support and Out-of-Eden funding provided to Eden Court (not including the support for Higher Drama). This is equivalent to the budget reduction across Council services.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.059	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.059	

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This will be determined by Eden Court, and it is envisaged that they should continue to be able to fulfil the terms of the Service Delivery Agreement. Eden Court may need to revise staff numbers or increase charges for some programmes.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Any changes in service delivery would affect any member of the community attending Eden Court.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

It would be for the Eden Court Board to consider how to implement the saving. Eden Court has a plan for delivering the savings but this may be compromised if funding from Creative Scotland is also reduced.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		Ref.	C&L/AD/12
Activity Heading	Criminal Justice			
Savings Name	Criminal Justice			
Current Budget (£m)	£0.200m	Current Staffing (FTE)		

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

£200k criminal justice funding is provided from Highland Council with the Scottish Government funding the main part of service provision. Some of the Council funding is from the Alcohol and Drug Partnership for substance misuse services. 10% of the Council funding will be saved by reducing staffing levels in the community payback work order scheme.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.020	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.020	

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

The Council is committed to ensuring the community payback scheme is successful, and this is a relatively small budget reduction.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There may be an impact on the length of time it will take an offender to complete an order

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	This relates to offenders undertaking community payback work orders.
Mitigating action	Supervisors hours can be managed to deliver core services
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This will be managed by monitoring demands from court and reviewing overall service provision- community payback work order supervisors hours vary in response to demand for service. This will be managed.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		Ref.	C&L/AD/13
Activity Heading	Violence Against Women			
Savings Name	Womens Aid			
Current Budget (£m)	£0.651m	Current Staffing (FTE)		

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

The council currently funds the 4 Womens Aid groups in Highland to provide refuge and outreach support services for women and children across Highland. The funding helps run the refuges and to provide support to women to live safely in Highland communities.

The saving proposal is a 6% reduction in this funding.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.040	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.040	

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

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The reduction will mean that Womens Aid organisations will have to raise funds to maintain services at the same level or will have to reduce services to remain within budget. The impact is minimised as the saving is spread across 4 Womens Aid groups

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Women and children subjected to violence against women. As outlined above the funding supports women and their children living in refuges and supports women in the community living in or escaping from violent relationships.
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, EQIA undertaken.	Yes

Deliverability and Risks

It should be possible for the 4 Womens Aid groups to adapt services in line with the budget cut. This is dependent on other funders not looking for savings

Budget Template

Service	Care & Learning			Ref.	C&L/ED/3
Activity Heading	Primary & Secondary Education				
Savings Name	6% reduction in the non-staffing DSM budgets				
Current Budget (£m)	£66.6m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

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

This proposal will remove 6% from non-staffing devolved budgets. These fund equipment, utilities, furniture and other core services and supplies.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.080	-
2017/18	0.070	-
2018/19		
Total	0.150	-

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

This may impact on the Council's commitment to support Headteachers. It may also impact on capacity to close the attainment gap.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This saving is easier to manage in larger schools. It may result in some schools being unable to deliver the resources required by pupils

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	This will have a greater impact on small to medium schools as they already have less flexibility in their ability to manage their budgets.
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This saving is deliverable, albeit it will increase the challenge on smaller schools.

Budget Template

Service	Care & Learning			Ref.	C&L/ED/5
Activity Heading	Music Tuition				
Savings Name	Review the music tuition budget to deliver a 10% saving				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.283m	Current Staffing (FTE)	25+		

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

This proposal will bring the music budget into balance and also provide a 10% saving in the overall budget. It is proposed that a major review of the budget is carried out to deliver these savings, to focus the budget on support for music tuition.

The saving shown is after allowing for a 10% increase in music tuition fees, part of a corporate saving proposal in relation to Council fees and charges.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.020	
2017/18	0.050	
2018/19		
Total	0.070	

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

It is intended that the reconfigured service will focus on music tuition, sustaining attainment levels.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	This will have a greater impact on small to medium schools, particularly in rural areas, as they already have less flexibility in their ability to manage their budgets.
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This budget is often over spent on an annual basis. The saving is deliverable but will depend on the outcome of the review process. There is a risk of negative perceptions, especially if music tuition is not seen to be protected.

Budget Template

Service	Care & Learning			Ref.	C&L/ED/6
Activity Heading	Central Budgets				
Savings Name	Central supply budget				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.57m	Current Staffing (FTE)	NA		

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

This saving will shift the parameters where additional funding will be allocated to schools to meet their supply commitments.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.100	NA
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.100	NA

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

This will impact on the Council's commitment to support Headteachers. It may also impact on the Council's ability to close the attainment gap.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This could have an impact on Headteachers ability to deliver a balanced budget. It could also mean that pupils do not get the same level of teaching.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	This saving could impact significantly on the quality of learning teaching provided to pupils. It may have a greater impact on schools with smaller budgets, particularly in rural areas. ASN pupils would not be impacted as it is funded from the ASN budget.
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This will put additional pressure on Headteachers ability to deliver a balanced budget, in particular in schools with smaller budgets.

Budget Template

Service	Care & Learning		Ref.	C&L/ED/7
Activity Heading	Primary & Secondary Education			
Savings Name	Re-job sizing secondary promotion structures			
Current Budget (£m)		Current Staffing (FTE)		

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

This saving involves ensuring that pay for promoted staff in schools, reflect the changing roll and structure of that school.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.100	2.5
2017/18	0.050	1.1
2018/19	0.100	2.5
Total	0.250	6.1

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	This saving will deliver a standard promotion structure in schools.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This saving will require significant work to be carried out by the Service and trade unions. This would normally be programmed over a longer timescale.

Budget Template

Service	Care & Learning			Ref.	C&L/ED/8
Activity Heading	Central Budgets				
Savings Name	Reduction in the central training budget				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.040	Current Staffing (FTE)	NA		

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

To reduce the central training budget for teachers by £10,000.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.010	NA
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.010	NA

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

This may impact on the council's commitment to support Headteachers.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This is a marginal saving, but on a reducing budget, and will have an impact on our capacity to deliver of identified training priorities for teaching staff. It will have particular impact on our ability to improve the leadership development courses for our existing and future managers. In time, these factors are likely to impact on future performance.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	This saving will impact on our ability to provide all pupils with high quality staff.
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The saving is deliverable.

Budget Template

Service	Care & Learning		Ref.	C&L/ED/9
Activity Heading	Primary & Secondary Education			
Savings Name	Efficiency saving from revised school management			
Current Budget (£m)		Current Staffing (FTE)		

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

This saving proposal will look at a variety of existing staffing structures and policies, and is based upon the initial report endorsed by Committee in October 2015.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.200	5.0
2017/18	0.300	7.5
2018/19	0.300	7.5
Total	0.800	20.0

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

This is part of the programme to enhance support to schools and Headteachers.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This programme is critical to sustaining and enhancing the management and delivery of learning and teaching in Highland schools.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Savings will be achieved through revised structures which will be delivered on the basis of educational benefits.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This is a major programme, involving a full-time Head Teacher model, new school groupings and new management structures. It requires careful and co-ordinated planning, and will be rolled out over a number of years.

Budget Template

Service	Care & Learning			Ref.	C&L/ED/10
Activity Heading	Central Budgets				
Savings Name	Removal of the skills for work funding budget				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.060m	Current Staffing (FTE)	NA		

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

This saving will remove the discrete skills for work budget.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.060	NA
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.060	NA

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

This saving may impact negatively on attainment levels of young people in Highland. It may impact negatively on providing young people with the appropriate skills for the work

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The budget supports secondary schools in providing resources to enable skills for work courses to be delivered., meeting a wide variety of costs such as transport, clothing and equipment. The removal of this budget is likely to impact on the delivery level of skills for work courses, as school DSM budgets are under considerable pressure.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The budget cut may impact on young people significantly in the middle to lower ability range. A small number of these could be young people with ASN and is likely to impact more on young people from lower socio-economic groups.
Mitigating action	It may be possible to obtain funding from businesses to replace this budget.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken. No full EQIA required.

Deliverability and Risks

This saving is deliverable, albeit there is a risk that costs are displaced somewhere else.

Budget Template

Service	Care & Learning		
Activity Heading	Education		
Savings Name	6% Saving for Plockton School of Traditional Music		
Current Budget (£m)	£0.235m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A

Ref. C&L/ED/11

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

This saving proposes to apply a 6% saving target to the funding provided to the school.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.014	-
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.014	-

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The School is able to achieve a range of efficiency measures.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)		No
If no, state why	Pupils who access the Music School are selected by audition from a range of different areas in Highland.	
If YES, state why		
Mitigating action		
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This saving is deliverable.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/CS/1
Activity Heading	Residential care				
Savings Name	Cease use of all spot purchased beds with external contractor				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.353m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

Spend on spot-purchased provision with the current contractor was £1.353m in 2014/15. The proposal is to phase out the use of the spot-purchased beds, whilst retaining some capacity for unplanned placements.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.550	0
2017/18	0.450	0
2018/19		
Total	1.000	0

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

The Council programme commits to local placements for looked after children, and to putting their views at the heart of decision-making - therefore there should be continuing discussion with them about these plans.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There is a risk that a small number of young people may be placed further away as a result of reducing Highland-based placements, however only 5 of these placements will need to be taken out of service over the 2 years. Further work is underway to make it possible for young people to remain or return to their local communities at the same time.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	There will be fewer placement resources open to young people, particularly when a placement is required in a crisis situation.
Mitigating action	Work is already in hand to free up resources by creating positive choices for young people able to move on into supported accommodation, freeing up residential placements.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No

3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No See below
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, mitigation identified, see below. Full impact assessment not required.	

<p>Deliverability and Risks</p> <p>There is significant challenge with this proposal, given the cost of an individual placement, but it is a necessary and progressive initiative. Considerable forward planning will be required to phase out the use of these placements. This can only be done as other suitable alternatives can be identified for individual young people. There could be an impact on the commitment to reduce young people placed outwith Highland, with some risk that placements will be required out of area. However, it is also likely that fewer young people may be placed in residential care.</p> <p>Equality impact screening identified a likely negative impact on boys, young people and disabled young people but recognised that there were mitigating factors in that there is already a programme in place to develop alternative services.</p>
--

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/CS/2
Activity Heading	Commissioned services				
Savings Name	10% reduction in contracts				
Current Budget (£m)	£4.277m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

Reduction of 10% across commissioned 3rd sector children's services, except those that support placements of Looked After Children, and contribution of £0.092m from funds no longer allocated for these services. The organisations affected are listed below. They would have six months' notice to plan for the reduction in funding.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.199	0
2017/18	0.098	0
2018/19		
Total	0.297	0

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

This will reduce community based provision and capacity for preventative and early years services.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Most of these services are very early intervention, therefore don't immediately or directly impact on Highland Council performance targets. Some are more specifically commissioned to achieve certain targets, and these would have to be renegotiated during contract reviews. It's likely that a lower level of service will result, for example meaning fewer children or families can be offered a service.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The impact will be across a number of different providers of services, and across a wide range of types of service provision. Most SLAs purchase a direct service for children and families, some provide information, advice and support or advocacy. The organisations range in size from small local groups to national voluntary organisations. Some smaller organisations may be more reliant on Highland Council funding.
Mitigating action	Notice period of 13 weeks is required. Services for Looked After Children are mainly not affected. Organisations likely to be impacted have been advised of this proposal.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, some impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Due to notice periods required, only part-year savings can be delivered in 2016/17 and the savings will be phased over two financial years.

Details of services affected

10% reduction

1. Sutherland Young Carers (TYKES) (support for young carers)
2. Skye and Lochalsh Young Carers (support for young carers)
3. Relationship Counselling (counselling support)
4. National Autistic Society (information and support to parents on autism specific topics)
5. Home-Start Easter Ross (support to families)
6. Home-Start Ross and Cromarty (support to families)
7. Home-Start Caithness (support to families)
8. Highland Children's Forum (consultation and engagement)
9. Who Cares? Scotland (advocacy for Looked After and care experienced young people)
10. Safe, Strong and Free (awareness raising/training for parents and professionals)
11. Crocus Child Bereavement (bereavement support)
12. Children 1st (support to kinship carers and trauma recovery support)
13. CALA Family First (volunteer-based support to families)
14. CALA (childhood practice and family support services)
15. Keeping Children Safe (awareness raising)
16. CHIP+ (information, support and advice)
17. Action for Children (support and mentoring for young people)
18. The Springboard Charity (Face to Face) (support for care leavers)
19. CAB (service specific to care leavers)
20. Highland Boxing Initiative (diversionary activity)
21. Counselling Care (short-term funding for counselling service in Skye).

Funding to be withdrawn

1. Grant for Adult Deaf Education (trips and activities)

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/CS/4
Activity Heading	Early Years staff training				
Savings Name	Reduce training budget				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.236m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

The proposal is to reduce the available budget for staff training dedicated to the Early Years workforce.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.100	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.100	0

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

There is a commitment in the Council programme to increase the Early Years staffing. This proposal would mean a reduced per capita budget.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No major impact is anticipated.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	There will be no direct impact on service delivery.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

There has been an established underspend on this budget so the saving is achievable without any significant impact.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/CS/5
Activity Heading	Children's Services management				
Savings Name	Delete 2 Children's Services management posts				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.800m	Current Staffing (FTE)	15		

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

This proposal recommends the deletion of two posts from the Children's Services management structure. The first post covers the strategic planning of support to families and there is currently someone in post. The second post is currently the lead officer for Early Years, but this will be superseded by a revised staffing structure, agreed by Committee to achieve the expansion of early learning and child care. There is currently someone in post.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.120	2
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.120	2

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

Post 1) The leadership regarding delivery of parenting programmes will be provided through a new Early Years area-based structure.
 Post 2) A new strategic post has already been put in place for Early Years as part of this new arrangement.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No major impact is anticipated as new arrangements will be put in place to cover the responsibilities.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The responsibilities of these posts will be covered by new structures.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

One of these posts does not carry line management responsibilities and the strategic planning duties can be covered through the Supporting Parents Improvement group.
 The second post will be deleted as part of the re-structure of Early Years services. The post-holders may require redeployment.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/CS/6
Activity Heading	Early Years staffing structure				
Savings Name	Maximisation of grant funding				
Current Budget (£m)	£15.0m	Current Staffing (FTE)	400+		

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

The service is undergoing a re-structure in order to deliver against Scottish Government policies for early years and childcare. The new structure will create closer integration between education, social care and third sector services, and strengthen the area dimension of future service planning.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.438	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.438	0

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

The new structure will enhance the Council's ability to fulfil the commitments in the Council programme.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The intention is to improve on service performance by linking delivery to District Partnership plans and providing an area-based structure to implement strategic developments.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	A new structure will replace existing posts and will enhance the delivery of services through an area-based structure.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The plans for the new structure have already been approved. The Early Years and child care budgets have been significantly under-spending and the new structure will provide an improved platform for the transformation of services.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/CS/7
Activity Heading	Wrap-around childcare				
Savings Name	Increase income target				
Current Budget (£m)	£15.0m	Current Staffing (FTE)	400+		

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

Wrap-around childcare already generates significant income and there are improved opportunities to increase this based on the Scottish Government's policy to increase wrap-around hours and choice, by extending local authority provision.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.060	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.060	0

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

Potentially a positive impact if wrap-around care is significantly increased.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No negative impact is anticipated.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	It is anticipated that the income will increase through improved uptake.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This could prove to be a modest target given the performance to date. 13 Child Care Managers are already being appointed to increase flexibility and capacity in the larger provisions.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/CS/8
Activity Heading	Unallocated budget				
Savings Name	Delete unallocated budget				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.106m	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

This funding was created from the review of Support Workers in the service and earmarked for community capacity building activities but has not yet been allocated against any specific activity.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.106	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.106	0

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

This would marginally reduce the capacity to support community capacity building activities.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No impact on existing services.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The funding has not been allocated against specific activity.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.	

Deliverability and Risks

Currently the funding is not allocated and therefore could be freed up for savings.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/CS/9
Activity Heading	Child & Adolescent Mental Health Social Workers				
Savings Name	Deletion of posts				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.086m	Current Staffing (FTE)	2		

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

This proposal recommends the deletion of two posts from the Children's Services social work establishment. They are specialist posts attached to the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service, which is managed by NHS Highland.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.086	2
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.086	2

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

None anticipated.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

These posts are specialist and do not carry a statutory caseload in the same way as other Council social workers. They support and contribute to the work of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health team which is funded and commissioned by NHS Highland. No major impact is anticipated in terms of the wider delivery of social work services.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The posts offer direct support to some children as part of the CAMHS service.
Mitigating action	The posts are part of a team of mental health specialist posts. Indications are that the workload would be reviewed across the team, but that some services may be reduced, based on risk-assessment.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	Yes

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, equality impact identified and equality impact assessment undertaken.

Deliverability and Risks

These posts are currently occupied and the staff would require to be redeployed into social work vacancies.

Budget Template

Service	Care & Learning			Ref.	C&L/CS/10
Activity Heading	Early Years				
Savings Name	Removal of Principal Teachers & Quality Improvement Officers in Early Years				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.4m	Current Staffing (FTE)	24		

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

This proposal involves efficiencies from the redesign of curricular and quality support for Early Learning and Childcare that is presently underway, including deleting the current posts of Principal Teacher and Quality Improvement Officer. The scheduling of post deletion will be subject to confirmation due to the alignment with service re-design. The envisaged number of posts affected are noted here, and progress with the review will be reported to Committee .

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.130	4 tbc
2017/18	0.070	4 tbc
2018/19		
Total	0.200	8 tbc

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

It is intended that the newly configured service will offer an improved delivery mechanism for Early Years provision.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This saving proposal is deliverable. It involves considerable redesign and restructuring, which would ideally be managed over a longer timeframe. It will be necessary to ensure consistent curricular and quality support across all provision.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/RES/1
Activity Heading	School Transport				
Savings Name	Concessionary Charges				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.250m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

The Council has in recent years implemented charges for concessionary places on school transport, with these currently levied at a flat £1 per day.

It is proposed to review the level of charges, and review implementation of the current charging process, with a view to increasing the level of income derived. The saving represents a 100% increase on current income levels.

This will be achieved by increased monitoring and enforcement of the charging regime, and by reviewing the charging level.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.025	Nil
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.025	Nil

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The policy would apply pan Highland and to all pupils in receipt of concessionary transport.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Monitoring and enforcement of the current charging regime represents the largest risk around deliverability. The Council will have to work with schools and transport operators to improve the levels of charges levied where they are due. Given the relatively modest income involved, any increased monitoring and enforcement will have to be from within existing resources.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/RES/2
Activity Heading	School Transport				
Savings Name	ASN Transport review				
Current Budget (£m)	£2.1m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

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

The current budget for Additional Support Needs school transport is £2.1m, which includes a sum of £0.350m for escorts. This aspect of school transport is not covered by the current transformational project, which is focused on mainstream school and public bus provision. It is therefore proposed to target a 6% saving on this budget.

The saving will be achieved through reviewing current arrangements and considering a range of options, which would include looking at more cost effective transport options and looking at service levels.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.126	tbc
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.126	tbc

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

Care needs to be taken to ensure this measure does not reduce support for children with additional support needs

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The Council will still meet its statutory requirements and provide transport based on a needs assessment.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The proposal relates only to ASN transport, and will therefore impact only on ASN pupils. Previous school transport saving proposals have excluded ASN, and therefore this proposal now brings this budget into scope for savings.
Mitigating action	Transport requirements will continue to be focused on the needs of the child.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, mitigation identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

ASN is a demand led service, and it is known that current demand for all ASN services is placing pressure on budgets. In that respect, ASN transport is no different to other aspects of ASN service delivery. However, it is envisaged that an integrated approach to planning for educational and transport needs, will enable a more joined up approach, thereby achieving the saving.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/RES/3&4
Activity Heading	School Transport				
Savings Name	Gaelic and Denominational Transport				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.400m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

While the Council has a clearly defined policy for mainstream school transport, linked to the relevant legislation, arrangements for Gaelic and Denominational school transport have grown organically and have not been formally reviewed for some years. Current spend is £0.332m and £0.070m respectively. To ensure equality and consistency of policy, it is therefore appropriate to review arrangements for Gaelic and denominational school transport.

Implementation will be progressed through review of school transport policy, with revised policy to be approved by Education, Children and Adult Services Committee

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.024	Nil
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.024	Nil

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

Highland First reference 34 and Gaelic language plan

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The proposal may be achieved through a reduction in service provided (i.e. reducing entitlement) or by charging for transport for pupils outwith the revised entitlement. Changes could also deter parents from accessing Gaelic Medium or denominational education.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The proposal would impact upon Gaelic and denominational school transport users. The proposal equalises the impact but it is not disproportionately negative. An outcome of the review could be to implement a policy which has greater consistency across gaelic/denominational school transport entitlement, and also greater consistency with mainstream school transport entitlements .
Mitigating action	At present the entitlement distances applying are in excess of that which applies for mainstream transport.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, the proposal equalises the impact but it is not disproportionately negative. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The saving would be implemented as part of the review of school transport policy. There is potential for challenge where no nearby alternative Gaelic or denominational schooling exists.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/RES/6
Activity Heading	Building Cleaning				
Savings Name	Reduction in the building cleaning budget				
Current Budget (£m)	£4.89m	Current Staffing (FTE)	291.7 (821 posts)		

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

Implement a further reduction in the cleaning service.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.090	6.1
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.090	6.1 (18 staff)

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The proposal will result in a further reduction in cleaning service levels within facilities.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Reduction in service delivery. Reduced hours of work and availability of employment especially for female lower paid workers.
Mitigating action	Impact is across service highland wide; consultation would take place with staff and RPO's to deliver the savings; redeployment would be first option.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	Yes

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken. It is acknowledged that the impact is more likely to affect female staff and that staffing impact will require to be monitored as part of the overall management of staffing changes.

Deliverability and Risks

This saving proposal is in addition to significant savings determined for building cleaning in the December 2014 budget (2016/17 - £580,000). The compound effect of successive reductions in the building cleaning budget will have consequences for the service to be delivered in terms of cleanliness and hygiene.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/RES/7
Activity Heading	School Catering				
Savings Name	Introduce charges for Hostel pupil lunches				
Current Budget (£m)	£6.96m	Current Staffing (FTE)	347 (692 posts)		

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

Introduce charging for lunches for hostel pupils, where traditionally they have been provided at no charge.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.023	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.023	n/a

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No impact.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	There is no legal requirement to provide a midday meal at no charge to hostel pupils and is inconsistent with arrangements for non-hostel pupils
Mitigating action	Consultation would take place with parents/carers and pupils, if any pupil comes under the statutory eligibility for free school meals this will be put in place.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This change would bring hostel pupils onto a comparable basis to non-hostel pupils. Any pupil eligible for free school meals would continue to receive this. Pupils could choose to eat elsewhere ie local shop.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/RES/8
Activity Heading	School Catering				
Savings Name	Redesign menu options to achieve savings				
Current Budget (£m)	£6.96m	Current Staffing (FTE)	347 (692 posts)		

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

Redesign the menu options: reduce use of meat products; use vegetable protein /pulses as part of the dish; look at low cost menu choices.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.160	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.160	n/a

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The changes would not affect the nutritional value and statutory requirement of The Schools (Health Promotion And Nutritional) (Scotland) Act 2007.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Applies to all catering outlets and customers
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Some trialling of these proposals have already taken place within schools. Could be some negative feedback from service users, though this is mitigated by the extent to which trials have already taken place to replace fresh meat with vegetable protein /pulses as part of the dish.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/RES/10
Activity Heading	School Catering				
Savings Name	Conveyancing of school meals				
Current Budget (£m)	£6.96m	Current Staffing (FTE)	347 (692posts)		

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

This service is currently provided externally via contracts. It is proposed to give notice to part of the current contractual arrangements, and take responsibility for in-house of service delivery through janitorial services for the transportation of school meals from production kitchen to dining centre.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17		
2017/18	0.050	
2018/19		
Total	0.050	

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No impact

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Legitimate change in contractual arrangement and potential transfer to in-house provider.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This will make a more cost effective use of the current fleet, spread the overhead costs within the service, and widen the scope of the Janitorial services post. The level of savings is estimated at this time, and subject to review.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		Ref.	C&L/RES/12
Activity Heading	Resources Teams - Service Information and Support			
Savings Name	Review team structure			
Current Budget (£m)	£0.600m	Current Staffing (FTE)		

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

The saving would be delivered through a review of the team structure.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.030	1
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.030	1

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There would be some impact on service levels for reporting processes, with this mitigated through restructuring and re-prioritising workload within the team.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Many, though not all services provided, are internal in nature, i.e. to other Council teams rather than direct to the public. Efforts will be made to ensure that through structure redesign, any potential impact on external customers is minimised.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This team provides support to schools and others parts of the Care and Learning Service in relation to systems, processes, data, FOI/complaints and performance management, and care will need to be taken that this is not compromised.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/RES/13
Activity Heading	Property Costs				
Savings Name	Community, Learning and Leisure Properties				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.4m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

The Council owns a number of properties where tenancies are currently subsidised through only part of the property operating costs being passed on to tenants. These facilities do not operate Highland wide, and many of the property agreements are historic and have not been reviewed in some time.

The saving proposal is based upon moving to a full cost recovery model for these tenancies, with full costs associated with utilities (heat, light, water) and any other operating costs being met by the tenants (either directly or through recharge from the Council).

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17		
2017/18	0.048	Nil
2018/19		
Total	0.048	Nil

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No direct impact on Council service performance. There could be implications for partner operations being provided from these facilities.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	The proposal relates only to Inverness and Wick, as these are the only locations where the Council owns these types of facility.
Mitigating action	While the saving proposal may have a negative financial impact on the tenants, the proposal will address current inequalities whereby only the tenants in these locations benefit from subsidised arrangements.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes tenants may also be impacted by reductions in Council

	grants to vol orgs
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.	

Deliverability and Risks If agreed, the saving can be implemented through giving notice to tenants. The major risk around deliverability is the ability of tenant organisations to meet these increased costs, which in some cases could be impacted if the organisation's own funding sources are being reduced by the Council or other funding body cuts.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/RES/14
Activity Heading	Property Costs				
Savings Name	Community, Learning and Leisure Properties (HLH)				
Current Budget (£m)	£1.4m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

The Council retains ownership and landlord responsibilities for properties occupied by Highlife Highland. As well as maintenance, the Council also retains budget and responsibility for operational costs including utilities.

It is proposed to target a saving in year 2, based upon the outcome of HLH's own proposals to deliver budget savings against their own target, involving any reduction in the capital estate.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17		
2017/18	0.021	Nil
2018/19		
Total	0.021	Nil

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

None, albeit there may be implications regarding any service delivery changes.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	N/A
If no, state why	This saving will be progressed as part of ongoing review with HLH of operational delivery requirements. Equality and other implications will be assessed by HLH as part of assessment of their own budget saving and change programmes.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	N/A
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	N/A for HLH to lead on impact assessments

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, potential impact. Recommendation for HLH to lead on impact assessment.

Deliverability and Risks

Dependent on discussion and agreement with HLH, as tenant of these properties.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/RES/15
Activity Heading	School Lets				
Savings Name	Additional School Let Income				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.260	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

The Council has already agreed to a review of the school lets charging policy, and an additional income target of £0.150m on top of the £0.260m currently received. This saving proposal is for a further £0.035m.

A review is underway, to review the current policy and status of free lets, which is the means by which any saving would be delivered.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.035	-
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.035	-

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

There could be reduced use of school facilities as community hubs

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Increasing charges may negatively impact on the number of school let bookings.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The intention would be to introduce a revised and equitable charging policy.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	Impact assessment will be undertaken for revised policy

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified at present. Full impact assessment to be undertaken on revised policy.

Deliverability and Risks

This saving would result in the cumulative need to deliver a c70% increase in income, and is dependent on consistent, robust application across the authority.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning		
Activity Heading	Senior Management		
Savings Name	Reduction of 2 Senior Management Posts		
Current Budget (£m)	£1.6m	Current Staffing (FTE)	17

Ref. C&L/RES/17

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

The Service will reduce 2 Senior Management Posts through restructuring of the Service.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.150	2
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.150	2

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

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Through management restructuring, different ways of providing management support will be implemented.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Subject to service management team restructuring.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/ASN/3
Activity Heading	Additional Support Needs				
Savings Name	Closure of Black Isle Education Centre				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.331m	Current Staffing (FTE)	9.4		

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

It is proposed to close the special school on the Black Isle. This also provides outreach support and links with other services. A formal statutory consultation will commence in coming month. It will though be necessary to establish new specialist provision for Inverness and Ross-shire children with social, emotional and behavioural needs, providing both onsite and outreach support for pupils whose mainstream educational placements are at risk of breakdown due to their anxieties and social/emotional difficulties. 2 FTE teaching vacancies exist within the current staffing and it is proposed not to replace these posts. It is further proposed to reduce the staffing by a further 1FTE Social Care Worker post. The remaining 6.4FTE will continue to provide a service to children and young people with SEBN in the Area in the redesigned service.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.200	3
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.200	3

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

No negative impact.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There should be no significant impact on the service provided to children and young people as the redesign of this service has already begun and the outreach model has already been shown to be effective. Two vacancies are currently within the system and other savings should be possible with transport and energy costs through the use of the mini-bus to pick up pupils rather than taxis and the creation of a more energy efficient base for the service to work out of.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	This is part of a service re-design that will support more pupils on a part time basis, both on-site and within their local mainstream schools.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The planned service redesign for BIEC has already accounted for this reduction in staff and is therefore considered to be deliverable. There is a risk that other savings to the Area ASN budgets may result in a service being requested for more pupils and a subsequent pressure on the service that could lead to a request to increase staffing in response to this increased demand. Any delay in the creation of a new base for the service may delay the ability to make the savings on running costs within 2016-17, but these will be made in 2017-18 at the latest.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/ASN/4
Activity Heading	Additional Support Needs				
Savings Name	Savings from specialist services – ASL Legislation				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.200m	Current Staffing (FTE)	1		

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

Reduction in ASL Legislation budget of 50k. This is a budget established with the new ASL Legislation, to provide contingency following legal challenges from parents. We work to reduce the number and level of legal challenges, working with parents to find solutions to the issues they raise. Generally this has worked well, to the extent that this budget can be underspent. By continuing to manage the risk of legal challenge effectively at an earlier stage, it is expected that we can reduce this budget, with no negative impact on service delivery.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.050	Nil
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.050	Nil

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

No negative impact.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This saving will only impact if we have several high profile cases going to tribunal or being referred to the Court of Session, as these can be costly. However, we have processes in place to reduce the likelihood of cases escalating and would be confident that this saving could be made without any negative impact on service delivery or performance.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	This is a budget that covers legal costs as and when required. Generally it is underspent due to good management of processes at an earlier stage..
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	The ASL Coordinator will continue to manage all challenges regarding educational provision for pupils with ASN, in collaboration with Legal Service where required, to find solutions to parental concerns at an early stage.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, mitigation identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This savings proposal is deliverable if the demand on this budget remains at the levels noted over past years. There is a risk of an increase in the number and level of legal challenges however, should the Council be unable to meet the needs of children and young people with ASN. Parents may perceive this to be the case should other savings proposals relating to ASN be accepted, as they will impact significantly on the Council's ability to provide 'adequate and efficient' educational provision for this group of children and young people.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/ASN/5
Activity Heading	ASN Specialist Services				
Savings Name	Savings from specialist services – Autism Outreach Education Service				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.095m	Current Staffing (FTE)	2		

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

Redesign support for pupils with autism. Rather than providing a central Autism Outreach Education Service, support will be more local, with an increase in the level of awareness and understanding of Autism Spectrum Disorder through a systematic training strategy delivered at an Area level. One of the two current posts will remain in the South Area and will continue to provide training as part of the multi-agency training team at The Pines. The second post is currently vacant and will be deleted from the establishment.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.050	1
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.050	1

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

Negative impact on commitment 16 regarding children and young people, to 'enhance services for children who need additional support.'

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Initially this will cause some concern as the current specialism within Highland will be diminished. However, a number of staff have already embarked on the distance learning course in Autism and the service redesign will enable this expertise to be available more locally, at Area and ASG level rather than invested in a central post based in Inverness. The expectation is that this budget saving can be accommodated within a wider service redesign that will provide a better service in the medium and longer term.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes positive
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	A more locally based support structure will enable advice and consultation to be more readily available to school staff.
Mitigating action	Teaching staff and PSAs from each Area have been identified to undertake the Distance Learning ASD course at Birmingham University, as the first cohort accessing this training through the ASN training strategy. This will enhance the knowledge base at a local level. Awareness raising training can be delivered to school staff as required, more locally in areas, and higher level multi-agency training will continue to be delivered centrally to support practitioners.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, mitigation identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This is deliverable, but the Council will need to ensure it can provide specialist advice at a local level.

Budget Template

Service	Care and Learning			Ref.	C&L/ASN/6
Activity Heading	Additional Support Needs				
Savings Name	Savings from Service Level Agreement with Glachbeg Farm, to elaborate the curriculum for pupils with ASN.				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.018m	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

Reduction in SLA to purchase half day sessions at Glachbeg Farm from 6 sessions per week to 4 sessions per week. Only 2 of the 3 days currently contained within the SLA are used consistently in a way that supports a variety of children and young people to attend. The third day was added to the SLA several years ago to provide some ring fenced time for pupils who are Looked After, who required an element of outdoor education or elaboration to their curriculum. This additional day has not been used by many pupils and those who have used the day have tended to remain at Glachbeg for longer than anticipated due to other opportunities not being available. While the young people have enjoyed their time there, the outcomes for them would not indicate that this provision has been successful in being used in this way. The other two days per week (4 sessions), are used by the South and Mid Areas to make provision for a larger number of pupils in shorter, 6-12 week programmes of support, with more positive outcomes for the young people participating.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.006	Nil
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.006	Nil

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

Potential small, negative impact on commitment 16 regarding children and young people, to 'enhance services for children who need additional support.'

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Glachbeg makes provision for outdoor learning for a small number of pupils and while this saving will reduce the availability of this resource, there remains two days within the SLA that will continue to be offered for those children with the highest priority. In the meantime, schools are being encouraged to consider a wider range of outdoor activities for their pupils, within the Broad, General Education, that will enable needs to be met without a reliance on this type of resource.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes - potentially negative
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Although this provision has only been used for a small number of pupils, it has been available previously and this will be more limited in the future.
Mitigating action	Other provision and supports are available, focused much more on maintaining children and young people in school. This is a reduction in availability and there will still be other slots available should a pupil require to attend this provision.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, potential negative impact but mitigation identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

This reduction in the SLA is planned and the provider has been informed that the reduction will be made in the SLA for 2016-17. There are no concerns about the possibility of delivering this saving.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Ref.	D&I/2
Activity Heading	Planning and Building Standards				
Savings Name	Planning & Building Standards Fee Income				
Current Budget (£m)	£4.323m (fee income)	Current Staffing (FTE)	89		

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

Fee income is derived from Planning and Building Standards activity, which reflects the growing economy. Economic activity and construction application/consents are anticipated to rise.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.050	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.050	0

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

No impact on Council Programme.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This proposal limits the amount of finance available for service improvement initiatives.e.g. upgrading systems software.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Planning service is available to all. The savings proposal will limit finance for investment across the service equally.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverable given anticipated fee income for 2016/17

Risk would be of failure to meet income target as a result of limited economic growth.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Ref.	D&I/3
Activity Heading	Industrial & Investment				
Savings Name	Increased rental				
Current Budget (£m)	£2.164m (based on rental income for general account land and property	Current Staffing (FTE)	6.5		

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

Increased rental income from industrial property to offset savings targets.

Rental income will be increased from the industrial development/property portfolio, through improving quality of units and reducing void periods

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.050	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.050	0

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

The proposal will not impact on the Council Programme. The increased income will be achieved by quicker turnaround of voids and enhanced rents through energy efficiency improvements to industry units available to rent

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Improvement to turnover of void industrial units

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

As rents and demand are dictated by market forces there is always a risk that there may be a down turn in demand for industrial units however the sections track record maintaining rental income through the recession and the current healthy demand for industrial units particularly in inverness means the risk is minimal .

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Ref.	D&I/4
Activity Heading	Housing Development				
Savings Name	Development charges				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.215m	Current Staffing (FTE)	6.5		

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

Proposal is to increase housing development charges. There will be no significant service delivery implications.

Additional charges will be made to HRA Capital Programme. There will be no significant impact on Housing Revenue collected from Council tenants

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.025	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.025	0

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

The proposal will not impact on the Council Programme the increased charges will be capitalised as direct costs to the councils council house build programme.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There will be no significant service delivery implications

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The costs will be charged against specific council house build projects. The only risk is if the Council was to make a political decision to stop building any more council housing

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		Reference	D&I/5
Activity Heading	Visit Scotland (grant)			
Savings Name	Visit Scotland (grant)			
Budget (£m)	£0.150m (grant payment 15/16)	Staffing (FTE):		

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

Proposal is to reduce the grant payment made to Visit Scotland for the delivery of the tourism services in Highland.

Grant Payment

14/15 225k

15/16 150k

16/17 115k

Grant supports regional marketing activity in Highland only and the VIC network including in strategic centres in Inverness, Fort William, Aviemore, Portree, Thurso, Ullapool and Fort Augustus.

There are limited implications for service delivery as the Council's relationship with VS is under review at present. VS role nationally is also under review and it is recognised that there are now quickly changing and modernising means of promoting tourism nationally.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.035	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.035	0

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

The proposal will not impact significantly on the Council Programme. Provision of support for VS will remain at a reduced level and future activity will focus on new ways of promoting tourism in the Highlands.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

No impact on HC performance. Reduction of funding grant to Visit Scotland.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Changing focus of tourism promotion may result in the reduced need for TICs in some areas. Not yet defined however any reduction is more likely to be in rural locations with lower footfall.
Mitigating action	Focus agreement with VS on more modern means of promoting tourism in the Highlands and where demand for TICs remains greatest.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Easily delivered as financial support is discretionary.

Risk allied to this proposal is that there may eventually be reduced TIC coverage in some areas of the Highlands.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Review Work for Common Good		
Savings Name	Review Charges to Common Good		
Current Budget (£m)	£	Current Staffing (FTE)	

Ref. D&I/7

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

Review charging regime for service provided to common good funds throughout Highland. Increase charges where appropriate.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.020	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.020	0

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

No Impact on Council Programme

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

None

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	No impact as internal charges
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

N/A

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Reference	D&I/8
Activity Heading	Business advice and business support				
Savings Name	Business advice and business support				
Budget (£m)	£0.682m	Staffing (FTE):	28.1		

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

Review and re-organisation of the Council's provisions for business advice and support. Highland Opportunity Ltd is the delivery mechanism for the Councils business advice and support services, including the Business Gateway service, the Enterprise Loan Fund, Enterprise Europe Network activity, the property portfolio and Prince's Trust Youth Business Support.

The Board of Highland Opportunity Ltd asked that the Highland Council conduct an internal review of the organisation. The scope of the review was agreed by the board on 2nd October 2015. Within scope were the sustainability of the current financial position, the likelihood that the financial recovery plan will deliver sustainability for the organisation in a reasonable timescale, and the efficiency of HOL as the delivery mechanism for HC services. It was anticipated that the review would identify areas where savings could be made and, potentially, where income can be generated.

The review recommendations were considered by a special HOL board meeting on 14th January 2016 when the Board agreed to wind up the Company and to transfer some of the existing activities to Highland Council. The Board decision will be reported to the 17th February 2016 PDI. Implementation is expected to take place during the next 6 months.

Savings will be generated via a reduction in management overheads, admin and property costs, and via income received as loan repayments and interest.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.100	4 - 6(Est)
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.100	4 – 6(Est)

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

There is no anticipated impact on the delivery of the Highland Council Programmes.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Detailed impacts are unknown ahead of the implementation of the HOL Board's decision. Review objectives include the identification of efficiencies and alternative delivery options. Final proposals will seek to retain service provision.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
--	-----------

If no, state why	Throughout the implementation of the review outcomes the presumption will be that the level of service via Business Gateway, business loans and the Prince's Trust Programme will be maintained. There is no predicted rural impact.	
If YES, state why		
Mitigating action		
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)		No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		No
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.		

Deliverability and Risks

The proposed savings are deliverable.

Risks identified are in the ongoing management of customer relations and service delivery during the implementation of the winding up of HOL and the transfer of activities to Highland Council.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Ref.	D&I/9
Activity Heading	Trading Standards				
Savings Name	Re-structure of service provision				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.831m	Current Staffing (FTE)	17		

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

Re-structure to deliver savings within the Council's Trading Standards (TS) service. There are currently 17 posts within the Council Trading Standards team. A number of staff within the TS team have indicated their desire to leave the Council and this necessitates the re-structuring of the team. The team will be re-structured during 2016/17 to deliver savings and prioritise service provision.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.130	4.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.130	4.0

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

There will be an impact on the availability of Trading Standards services across the Highlands and the range of activities within the annually approved Trading Standards Operational Plan will require prioritisation. However there should be no impact on the delivery of the Council Programme.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There will be an impact on the range of Trading Standards activities available across the Highlands and the level of activity will need to be re-focused/prioritised. Service levels will reduce and service targets will need to be revisited to reflect this.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The Trading Standards service will continue to be delivered by the Council. Re-prioritised activity will be delivered across the Highlands.
If YES, state why	N/A
Mitigating action	N/A
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The proposal is deliverable.

There is the risk that consumer protection resources are spread more thinly across the Highlands and that as a result consumers are more vulnerable to fraudulent trading.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Reference	D&I/10
Activity Heading	Countryside Rangers				
Savings Name	Review of Countryside provision				
Budget (£m)	£0.783m	Staffing (FTE)	22.5		

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

The savings proposal consists of a reduction in Ranger resources available to the Council. Long Distance Route and Access provision would remain. Existing proposals will remove 2.5 fte posts (D&I/10 - £103k-includes 1 access officer to arrive at £103k).

Of the 20.0 remaining posts 7.0 fte have indicated a desire to leave the Council (£215k) 13FTE will remain.

The total saving proposal will be £381k which includes associated staff savings, increased income generation targets and reduced projects funds.

Reduction of ranger resources will reduce the ability to engage in the community, tourism, school visits (environment Curriculum for Excellence), ranger events, facilities management, community projects, biodiversity projects, local conservation projects (Merkinch), the summer events programme.

Re-prioritisation of work plans, increased income targets (£30k) and the implementation of the proposed survey team (D&I/10 - £50k) will contribute towards the costs of the remaining service.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.381	9.5
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.381	9.5

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

The Council Programme does not specifically mention the provision of Ranger activities. However Ranger activities support the delivery of Council Programme and SOA outcomes (Health and Wellbeing and Environment Chapters), contribute significantly to the statutory duties of the Council (Education/Biodiversity/Access/Health and Safety – 200+ properties assessed x2 annually with follow on actions implemented). SOA activity includes work in deprived areas and with people who have health issues. Ranger activities also contribute to the delivery of the cross cutting Service themes: Gaelic Language Plan, Carbon commitments.

Impact on Service Performance *(e.g. achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Ranger targets would be reviewed to reflect a reduced service. As Rangers contribute across the service, targets for facilities management, core paths and biodiversity would also be reviewed.

Work programmes would be prioritised to focus on supporting statutory responsibilities and income generation.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	N/A
If YES, state why	Ranger activities support tourism, schools activities, the management of our facilities disadvantaged and less favoured groups across all geographic areas(rural & urban) of the Council.
Mitigating action	Re-prioritising work plans to support statutory responsibilities, mitigate equalities impacts and to income generation.

2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes (D&I 10), (D&I 13)
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, no significant equality impact identified. No predicted rural impact.	

Deliverability and Risks Saving can be delivered.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		Ref.	D&I/11
Activity Heading	Across all Heads			
Savings Name	Management Review			
Current Budget (£m)	£1.326m	Current Staffing (FTE)		

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

Proposal is to undertake a management review with the likely outcome being a reduction in management grade FTE. This will initially focus on the Planning & Building Standards part of the Service.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.060	1.6
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.060	1.6

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

No impact on Council Programme

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The review will focus on providing a more efficient service rather than any overall reduction.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Service will be maintained across all Council areas and offices.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Review will focus on the current management structure, and will be concluded by March 2016. There may be costs arising to the service depending on outcomes of the review.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		Ref.	D&I/12
Activity Heading	Property Service Delivery			
Savings Name	Reduction of the Corporate Property Asset Management K2/IT Development Budget			
Current Budget (£m)	£0.305m	Current Staffing (FTE)		

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

- The Proposal is to reduce the K2/IT Development Budget by £40K. This will reduce the amount of development that can be achieved with the Property K2 IT system.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.040	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.040	0

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

- No Direct Impact on the Council programme.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

- This budget reduction will reduce the speed at which the Property IT system can be developed.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The Property IT software development will continue but at a slightly slower pace, so future system improvements will take longer to deliver. The impact will be negligible to existing customers.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	We will negotiate harder with Software Developers to attempt to achieve more for less investment. (Where possible).
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

- The £40k saving will be delivered.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Reference	D&I/13
Activity Heading	Environmental Consultancy Service				
Savings Name	Environmental Consultancy Service				
Budget (£m)	£1.130m	Staffing (FTE)	32		

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

This proposal links directly with the D&I10 proposal: Countryside, Access and LDRs

The proposal is to create an internal environmental consultancy team to support the delivery of the Capital Programme. The team will deliver environmental studies and advice on species and habitats, and environmental impact assessment advice and contribute to the major applications process. The team will be established during 2016/17 and an appropriate portion the costs of the service will be re-charged to the capital programme.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.050	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.050	0

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

There will be no impact on the delivery of the Council Programmes. The new service will support the delivery of the Capital Programme and the major applications process.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

A new service provision. Performance will focus on the provision of in-house consultancy supporting the capital programme.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	No impact as service will continue
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Proposed savings can be delivered during 2016/17.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Reference	D&I/14
Activity Heading	Employability				
Savings Name	Employability				
Budget (£m)	£1.522m (excluding £440k Deprived Area Fund)	Staffing (FTE):	14.45		

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

The Employability team provide a range of services to support young people (16+ who are not in work or in education/training) and adults (who need support to overcome barriers) to progress towards and into sustained employment. These services are client driven and provided across Highland.

The saving proposal seeks to reduce the core Employability budget by an additional £250k in 16/17 (already £50k agreed in 16/17). The additional savings includes a further reduction in the budget available for support services and a restructuring of the Employability Team in preparation for the new EU funded Employability Programme. As EU funding is anticipated this, will together with remaining Employability funding, mitigate against Service reduction.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.250	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.250	0

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

- The Council Programme has a number of employability and workforce commitments (31: Building the Local Economy; 32: Region for Young People; 43: Additional Support Needs; 50: Poverty and Deprivation and Inverness City Social Equality commitment).
- The SOA has two long-term outcomes to 1) widen participation in the labour market across all client groups and across all Highland geographies and 2) enable the regions' young people have the opportunity to flourish and to contribute to the sustainable economic growth of the Highland economy.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

- The budget savings already taken from the Employability budget (£230k 15/16, £50k 16/17) plus this anticipated additional savings (£250k 16/17) will be managed/mitigated by the anticipated accessing of EU funds. Core service delivery together with improved alignment of Third Sector provision (due to Council managing additional EU funds) will ensure there is a pan Highland service delivered.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	Employability Services is delivered across Highland to a range of targeted individuals and geographies. The proposed saving will not change this.
If YES, state why	There will be a reduced level of service for customers across Highland and which may impact upon particular vulnerable groups e.g. young people and disabled people. People in rural areas will not be disproportionately impacted. There is likely to be variable impact across different rural communities.

Mitigating action	There will be impact on vulnerable groups however other activities such as the youth trainee scheme and the employment grant scheme will provide additional support where required, for example for disabled people. Future activities to be provided through the new European Funding Programme, will require to be more targeted in order to support those most vulnerable. Core service delivery to be monitored and reviewed to ensure clients from disadvantaged backgrounds, including geography, are supported to progress towards and into sustained employment.	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO) D&I/15 Deprived Area Fund and C&L/ED/10 Skills for work		Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)		No
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, negative impact noted and mitigation identified. A full EQIA not required.		

Deliverability and Risks Workplans and arrangements for accessing EU funds are well advanced including the required Council match funding which is provided for in remaining Employability budget. Risks minimal and manageable.
--

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		Reference	D&I/15
Activity Heading	Deprived Area Fund			
Savings Name	Deprived Area Fund			
Budget (£m)	£0.440m	Staffing (FTE):		

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

The Employability team provides a range of services to support young people (16+ who are not in work or in education/training) and adults (who need support to overcome barriers) to progress towards and into sustained employment. These services are client driven and provided across Highland with particular efforts made to support clients who are disabled, looked after or from a disadvantaged background. The Deprived Area Fund (DAF) currently disburses grant to third sector and other providers to provide additional local added value services in Highlands most deprived areas.

The saving proposal seeks to remove the DAF grant fund, leaving no funding for activity specifically focused across the existing deprived areas from 2016/17. Mainstream Employability funding will still be available to support activity across the Highlands, including in deprived areas. The implication is that there will be no grant recipients of DAF funding, resulting in a smaller number of out of work individuals or organisations benefitting from DAF resourced activity.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.440	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.440	0

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

- The Council Programme has a number of employability and workforce commitments (31: Building the Local Economy; 32: Region for Young People; 43: Additional Support Needs; 50: Poverty and Deprivation and Inverness City Social Equality commitment).
- The SOA has two long-term outcomes to 1) widen participation in the labour market across all client groups and across all Highland geographies and 2) enable the regions' young people to have the opportunity to flourish and to contribute to the sustainable economic growth of the Highland economy.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

- The budget savings already taken from the Employability budget (£230k 15/16, £250k 16/17) plus this anticipated additional savings (£440k 16/17) will be mitigated by the use of mainstream Employability funding which is EU matched. Core service delivery together with improved alignment of Third Sector provision (due to Council managing EU funds) will ensure there is a pan Highland employability service delivered. The DAF funded projects offer added value services and these will no longer be available in deprived areas.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	N/A
If YES, state why	The distribution of the DAF is based on the 15% of the "most deprived" datazones in Highland (SIMD 2012). DAF works alongside the core Employability team and services offered seeking to deliver local area focused added value services. The removal of the fund will impact upon vulnerable groups such as young people, disabled people and

	individuals from the lower socio-economic groups. There is likely to be variable impact across different rural communities. The proposed saving removes the ability to provide added value services in deprived areas.
Mitigating action	Core service delivery to be monitored and reviewed to ensure clients from disadvantaged backgrounds, including geography, are supported to progress towards and into sustained employment. For a number of organisations receiving this funding, they have client activity which crosses financial years and hence the proposed budget reduction will require to be managed carefully to ensure clients are not disadvantaged beyond April 2016.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO) D&1/14 Employability, C&L/AD/5&6 Preventative Health Services	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	Yes
Equalities Summary Screening undertaken, negative impact identified. Full EQIA completed.	

Deliverability and Risks

The DAF is an annual grant and hence activity paid for will be complete by 31 March 2016. No grant commitments in 2016/17 have been made but for a number of existing grant recipients, they have client activity which crosses financial years and hence the proposed budget reduction will require to be managed carefully to ensure existing clients are not disadvantaged.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Reference	D&I/16
Activity Heading	Biodiversity				
Savings Name	Reduce discretionary budget				
Budget (£m)	£0.0975m	Staffing (FTE)	1.0 (2 Jobshare) + Graduate		

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

Reduce the discretionary budget for biodiversity activity by £30k.

Graduate post ceases at end of June 2016.

The reduction in discretionary spend will limit the Council's ability to engage in, manage, and deliver partnership biodiversity projects. Delivery of the Council statutory biodiversity duty, to protect and promote, will be maintained without the support of demonstration projects.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.030	0.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.030	0.0

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

Biodiversity does not specifically feature in the Programme but Highland is well known for its environment and rich species biodiversity, which contribute significantly towards making the Highlands being an attractive place to live and work, and to the tourism of the area.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

The proposed saving will impact on the delivery of the Council's agreed Biodiversity Duty Implementation Plan, which seeks to support the protection and promotion of Highland biodiversity.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	No specific impact on customers, equalities or in rural locations. The impact on the protection and promotion of biodiversity will be equally felt across the Highland area.
If YES, state why	N/A
Mitigating action	N/A
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Easily delivered removal of a portion of the discretionary expenditure on biodiversity.
No significant risk.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Management		
Savings Name	Management savings		
Budget (£m)	£19.822m (Service)	Staffing (FTE)	415

Reference D&I/17

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

This savings proposal involves a reduction in management posts by 2 within the management grades HC12 and HC13.

It is anticipated that the voluntary severance scheme will necessitate the re-structuring of the D&I Service and that this will be undertaken during 2016/17.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.145	2.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.145	2.0

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

There should be no impact on the Council programme resulting from this restructuring proposal. There may be an impact which arises from the corporate VS/ER outcomes.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

There should be no impact on the Service performance as a result of this savings proposal. Corporate VS/ER outcomes will impact on performance Council wide.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Services will continue to be delivered by a restructured management team.
If YES, state why	N/A
Mitigating action	N/A
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

The savings proposal can be delivered during 2016/17.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Ref.	D&I/18
Activity Heading	Planning and Building Standards				
Savings Name	Planning & Building Standards Fee Income(PD Enquiries)				
Current Budget (£m)	£4.323m (fee income)	Current Staffing (FTE)	73		

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

Fee income is derived from Planning and Building Standards activity, which reflects the growing economy. Economic activity and construction application/consents are anticipated to rise. This is a new charge which is levied on those seeking advice as to whether domestic developments are permitted development or not. A fee of £40 will be levied in order to provide a written response to these queries which will be submitted via a new electronic form.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.010	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Aggregate	0.010	0

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

- No impact

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

- We already provide this service, but are now introducing a charge in order to cover the costs associated with assessing the enquiry and providing written confirmation. The introduction of the charge may mean that people decide not to seek advice.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Deliverable given anticipated fee income for 2016/17

Risk would be of failure to meet income target as a result of limited economic growth and that customers decide not to use the service because of the cost being introduced.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure			Ref.	D&I/19
Activity Heading	Property/Project Design Unit				
Savings Name	Reduction in use of external Consultants				
Current Budget (£m)	£0.450m	Current Staffing (FTE)	2		

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

Reduction in use of external Consultants by switching to in-house resource.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.100	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.100	0

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

- An improvement in the ability to react to requests for Surveys on Council Projects via the use of in-house resource.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

- An improvement in the ability to react to the request for project related surveys, resulting in a quicker turnaround and reduced surveying costs.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	Positive impact for project teams due to having competent in-house surveyors available to carry our survey works when required.
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

- The £100k saving will be delivered.

Budget Template

Service	Development & Infrastructure		
Activity Heading	Coastal & Aquaculture		
Savings Name	Review of Function/Activity		
Budget (£m)	£0.141m	Staffing (FTE)	3

Reference D&I/20

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

The proposal is to delete the dedicated aquaculture planning team, with the work in determining planning applications for aquaculture planning applications being divided up amongst existing planning officers in area offices. The numbers of planning applications are reducing so the current model is not sustainable. 2 FTE posts will be deleted with the third FTE post being retained as an aquaculture advisor – responsible for forward planning work and for commenting on the technical aspects of planning applications.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.095	2.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.095	2.0

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

No

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Aquaculture planning applications will continue to be processed by planners in area offices, so there is not expected to be a significant impact on processing times.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	We will still have one member of staff with detailed technical knowledge to support customers, albeit that planners will be dealing with the planning applications themselves.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities Summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Proposal is deliverable

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Savings			Ref.	CORP/1
Activity Heading	Income Generation				
Savings Name	Salary Sacrifice Schemes				
Current Budget (£m)	£0	Current Staffing (FTE)	0		

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

To add cycle to work, home technology, holiday purchase and car lease to our current, child care voucher salary sacrifice scheme.

CTW & HT launched in December 2015, Holiday purchase and Car Lease planned to be launched April 2016. Anticipated savings forecast at between £100-£600k dependent on staff numbers and participation.

Savings made through reduction in National Insurance payments and holiday pay.

Savings made over the length of agreement 12-36 months

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.200	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.200	N/a

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

More engaged staff

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	Schemes open to all staff
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Number of staff employed and number who choose to take up the offers determines the level of savings made.

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Savings			Ref.	CORP/2
Activity Heading	Income Generation				
Savings Name	Fees & Charges				
Current Budget (£m)	-£16.321m	Current Staffing (FTE)	N/A		

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

To apply a 10% increase on all fees and charges made by THC that are not nationally set, or a different amount has already been agreed.

Ferry dues are limited by contract to 2% and Commercial waste by market forces.

School meals : overall increase of 10% which includes the agreed saving of £138k from December 2014. This results in school meal charges of £2.55 secondary and £2.30 primary.

Other variances above 10% are due to increases not been applied in previous years (wedding fees, memorialisations etc.) and budget over achievement.

The % budget increases are shown on the attached spreadsheet.

The proposal results in additional budgeted income of £1.101m. This amount is reduced by the £0.614m income inflation for fees and charges included within the roll forward budget assumptions, to result in net savings of £0.487m.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.487	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.487	

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

None anticipated

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

None anticipated

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	Yes
If no, state why	
If YES, state why	There will be an impact upon customers and specific groups of customers. The increase in school meals, wraparound care and music tuition fees will impact upon families. General fee increases may impact upon individuals in lower socio-economic groups.
Mitigating action	Free school meals and free music tuition are in place for individuals on lower incomes as are concessionary fees for other charges. Certain fee increases have been limited due to their impact e.g. traveller sites and ferry charges.
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes

3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities summary Screening undertaken, limited equality impact noted, mitigation identified. Full impact assessment not required.	

Deliverability and Risks Service heads and service heads consulted, risk lies with demand being suppressed caused by increased fees.
--

Service	Code	Description	Current Budget £	Increase %	Increase £
C&L	KC6103	Snack Bar Sales	-55,654	10.00%	-5,565
C&L	KC6105	Welfare Meals Income	-50,757	10.00%	-5,076
C&L	KC1926	Income From Training Courses	-4,080	10.00%	-408
C&L	KC1920	Board - Residents	-3,777	10.00%	-378
C&L	KC6104	Vending Machines Income	-902	10.00%	-90
C&L	KC1905	Admission Charges	120	10.00%	12
C&L	KC1936	Wraparound care, School transport & Court fees	-489,907	10.00%	-48,991
C&L	KC6102	School Meals Income	-4,114,565	10.00%	-411,457
Less :	Savings agreed HC 18/12/14				138,000
C&L	KC1910	Music Tuition Fees	-612,000	10.00%	-61,200
CEO	KC1952	Advertising & Sponsorship Income	-62,234	10.00%	-6,223
CEO	KC6800	Other Sales	-17,045	10.00%	-1,705
CEO	KC9500	Other Misc Income	-15,000	10.00%	-1,500
CEO	KC6401	Photocopies Sale	-1,754	10.00%	-175
CEO	KC1936	Other Fees / Charges	-413	10.00%	-41
CEO	KC1923	Property Clearance Fees	-371	10.00%	-37
CD	KC1707	Marry Outwith Work Wkend & P/H	-27,608	20.00%	-5,522
CD	KC1705	CM / CPR - Booking Fees	-14,849	20.00%	-2,970
CD	KC1706	CM / CPR - Outwith - Mon - Fri	-14,039	20.00%	-2,808
CD	KC1703	CM/CPR Accom Parties over 4	-11,840	20.00%	-2,368
CD	KC1704	CM / CPR - Office - Saturday	-11,475	20.00%	-2,295
CD	KC6401	Photocopies Sale	-1,400	20.00%	-280
CD	KC6805	Fax Income	-101	10.00%	-10
CD	KC1911	Legal Fees Recovery	-44,296	20.00%	-8,859
CD	KC4104	Liquor Licenses	-492,497	10.00%	-49,250
CD	KC4106	HMO licences	-326,766	10.00%	-32,677
CD	KC4107	Taxi & Private Hire Licenses	-228,124	10.00%	-22,812
CD	KC1914	Inspection Fees - Taxis & PHC	-93,252	10.00%	-9,325
CD	KC9200	Returns / Refunds	-36,804	40.00%	-14,722
CD	KC4105	Betting & Gaming Licenses	-36,866	10.00%	-3,687
CS	KC5008	Travelling People Site Rents	-183,000	1.90%	-3,477
CS	KC1603	Waste - Tipping Fees	-169,200	10.00%	-16,920
CS	KC6002	Foundations	-59,900	20.00%	-11,980
CS	KC1928	Subject Access Fees	-49,000	10.00%	-4,900
CS	KC6803	Other Sales Material	-46,000	10.00%	-4,600
CS	KC3000	Hire Of Equipment Income	-40,000	10.00%	-4,000
CS	KC3001	Hire Of Plant Income	-37,800	10.00%	-3,780
CS	KC4200	Fish Export Certificate	-23,600	10.00%	-2,360
CS	KC4100	Animals License Fees	-16,400	10.00%	-1,640
CS	KC3002	Hire Of Vehicles Income	-15,500	10.00%	-1,550
CS	KC2000	Fines	-14,800	10.00%	-1,480
CS	KC1905	Admission Charges	-13,800	10.00%	-1,380
CS	KC6000	Memorialisations	-6,900	20.00%	-1,380
CS	KC1923	Property Clearance Fees	-1,200	10.00%	-120
CS	KC4106	Other Civic Govt Licenses	-1,100	10.00%	-110
CS	KC1915	Fees for Cash Collection	-800	10.00%	-80
CS	KC1303	Residents Parking Income	-97,600	10.00%	-9,760
CS	KC1605	Domestic Bulky Uplifts	-64,300	10.00%	-6,430
CS	KC1601	Commercial Refuse Collection	-2,605,900	2.00%	-52,118
CS	KC1800	Ferry Dues	-2,565,000	2.00%	-51,300

CS	KC1300	Car Park Dues	-1,816,900	10.00%	-181,690
CS	KC1801	Pier / Harbour Dues	-1,417,500	10.00%	-141,750
CS	KC6800	Other Sales	-47,200	10.00%	-4,720
CS	KC1600	Special Collects/Uplifts Waste	-12,100	10.00%	-1,210
CS	KC1302	Parking Card Income	-3,700	10.00%	-370
CS	KC1301	Monthly Parking income	-6,600	10.00%	-660
CS	KC2018	Dog Fouling FP Fines	-300	100.00%	-300
D&I	KC1924	Letters of Comfort	-50,650	20.00%	-10,130
D&I	KC4107	Taxi & Private Hire Meters	-13,250	10.00%	-1,325
D&I	KC1100	Weights & Measures Fees	-11,200	10.00%	-1,120
D&I	KC6803	Other Sales Material	-2,200	10.00%	-220
D&I	KC6401	Photocopies Sale	-27,100	10.00%	-2,710
D&I	KC1945	Planning fees Advertising	-132,000	10.00%	-13,200
Total			-16,320,756	6.75%	-1,101,188

Less : Inflation included in roll forward budget assumptions

613,823

Savings for inclusion in savings template

-487,365

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Savings		Reference	CORP/3
Activity Heading	Energy			
Savings Name	Energy Savings			
Budget (£m)	£8.0m	Staffing (FTE)		

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

The proposal is to reduce the cost of all energy cost by £250,000, through a campaign of energy reduction, control adjustments and behavioural change combined with maximising the impact of the energy capital projects.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.250	
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.250	

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

None, the existing programme includes the works and changes that will implement the change. The Building management roll-out is to be a main focus of 2016-17.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

None, however comfort is to be maintained and discussion is required to ensure co-operation and buy-in with the behavioural campaign and adjustment process.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	This affects Council buildings and will be within the statutory and operational requirements for comfort and welfare.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No

Equalities summary

Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.

Deliverability and Risks

Significant support is required from management and staff to ensure that the actions taken are effective. There is a risk of individuals supplementing heating with own appliances or changing settings autonomously.

Budget Template

Service	Corporate Savings			Ref.	CORP/4
Activity Heading	Procurement				
Savings Name	Shared Service and Collaborative Spend				
Current Budget (£m)	N/A	Current Staffing (FTE)	Nil		

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

Work with Aberdeen City & Aberdeenshire Councils to obtain better value from contracts by combining the value of tenders. Also reviewing existing expenditure patterns and obtaining better value and lower cost from a range of goods and services purchased.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.500	0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.500	0

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

None

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

This proposal should enhance procurement performance

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	No impact on any customers.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	No
3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
Equalities summary	
Screening undertaken, no equality impact identified. Full impact assessment not required.	

Deliverability and Risks

The Shared Service agreement has not been finalised, and this proposal assumes a successful outcome. Actual savings achievable depend on the value of goods and services purchased, and compliance with contracts put in place.

Budget Template

Service	Council wide			Ref.	CORP/5
Activity Heading	Staffing				
Savings Name	Voluntary Redundancy Scheme (VRS)				
Current Budget (£m)	£324m	Current Staffing (FTE)	7,966 FTE		

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

A Voluntary Redundancy Scheme (VRS) was launched on 21 December 2015 and closed on 29 January 2016. At the Council meeting on 17 December the Chief Executive and Director of Finance were given delegated authority to approve or refuse "straightforward" applications.

341 (275 FTE) applications have been accepted, covering all services, on the basis that whilst a reduction in service capacity will result, this will still allow for the provision of safe and effective services within available resources. This saving is in addition to specific service savings, which the VRS will also help to achieve. The FTE shown below is net of specific service savings of 134 FTE (275 – 134 = 141 FTE).

Staff, where applications have been accepted, have until the 29 February 2016 to accept or refuse voluntary redundancy. Until that moment it is not possible to confirm a final position or full service implications. A report will be provided to a future Resources Committee outlining the full impact and outcome of VRS.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	5.900	141.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	5.900	141.0

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

Reduction of staffing on this scale will have an adverse impact on the Council programme. However, as stated above, under the delegated powers it is believed that all outcomes can still be achieved, although there may in some instances be some delay.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Reduction of staffing on this scale will lead to reductions in service performance. It is not possible at this stage to fully assess the implications. This will form part of the future report to Resources Committee.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The impact will be felt across all areas of the Highlands. Full service assessment will be undertaken when the full results from the VRS are known. Analysis of accepted applications by age, gender, grade and geography does not highlight any disproportionate impacts. Also the scheme was voluntary.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes

3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
<p>Equalities summary This is a voluntary scheme, so there are no equalities issues arising. The Council report (Annex 6) shows an analysis of all applications by service, grade, gender, age and geography</p>	

<p>Deliverability and Risks This saving is deliverable since this template reflects the results of the VRS. There is a small risk that some applicants will change their mind, and this will impact on the total financial saving. A full report on the final outcome, including financial implications, will be produced for a future meeting of Resources Committee.</p> <p>The main risk arises from the impact on Service delivery, and this can be mitigated by a full service re-design over the course of 2016.</p>
--

Budget Template

Service	Council wide			Ref.	CORP/6
Activity Heading	Staffing				
Savings Name	Recruitment Freeze for non-exempt posts				
Current Budget (£m)	£324m	Current Staffing (FTE)	7,966 FTE		

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

A freeze on all non-exempt posts has been applied since January 2016 and a panel consisting of the Chief Executive, Depute Chief Executive/Director of Corporate Development, and Director of Finance is meeting weekly to consider any Service request to fill a vacant post.

This scheme has been put in place to further reduce payroll costs in order to balance the budget and takes into account existing budget assumptions around vacancy management.

It also takes into account the VRS but recognises that regardless of this, there is a natural turnover of staff in the course of the year. The freeze on the filling of non-exempt posts will deliver a higher saving than that currently achieved through delays in filling posts.

A list of posts current exempt from a Recruitment Freeze is attached.

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2016/17	0.575	40.0
2017/18		
2018/19		
Total	0.575	40.0

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

Reduction of staffing, in addition to VRS, will have an adverse impact on the Council programme. However it is believed that all outcomes can still be achieved, although there may in some instances be some delay.

Impact on Service Performance *(eg achievement of targets, service levels etc)*

Reduction of staffing will lead to reductions in service performance. It is not possible at this stage to fully assess the implications. This will form part of future reports to Resources Committee and to Strategic Committees.

Customer Impact, Including Equalities & Rural Implications *(please reply YES or NO to questions 1-3 below)*

1. Will the change impact positively or negatively on particular groups of customers or in particular places? (YES/NO)	No
If no, state why	The impact will be felt across all areas of the Highlands. Full service assessment will be undertaken when the full results from the VRS are known.
If YES, state why	
Mitigating action	
2. Do other savings proposals impact on the same group of customers? (YES/NO)	Yes

3. If equalities impacts are identified above, a full impact assessment is needed. Is new information required to be gathered for that e.g. consultation with groups affected? (YES/NO)	No
<p>Equalities summary</p> <p>Compliance with equalities duties is part of the recruitment process for any posts that are to be filled. Posts that can be filled are included in the list of exempt posts from the vacancy freeze and others will be filled on an exception basis where service delivery implications require it.</p>	

<p>Deliverability and Risks</p> <p>This saving is deliverable but assumes a certain level of staff turnover that will result in posts not being filled. There is a risk to the saving if posts do not fall vacant during the year. This saving is on top of current assumptions regarding vacancy management, but is felt achievable given previous turnover rates for the Council.</p> <p>The main risk arises from the impact on Service delivery, and this can be mitigated by a full service re-design over the course of 2016.</p>
--

LIST OF EXEMPT POSTS – effective Jan 2016

1. Care and Learning

- Criminal Justice:
 - Principal Officer
 - Team Manager
 - Social Worker
 - Criminal Justice Officer
 - Administrative Assistant
 - Clerical Assistant
 - MAPPA Co-ordinator
 - Unpaid Work Officer
 - Unpaid Work Supervisor

- Residential:
 - Residence Manager
 - Residence Officer
 - Assistant Residence Officer
 - Unit Manager 37
 - Unit Manager 35
 - Depute Unit Manager
 - Social Care Team Manager
 - Senior Social Care Worker
 - Social Care Assistant
 - Social Care Worker 1
 - Social Care Worker 2

- ELCC:
 - Childcare Manager
 - Early Years Practitioner
 - Out of School Care Assistant
 - Out of School Care Auxiliary

- Teaching:
 - Head Teacher (Primary, Secondary and Cluster)
 - Depute Head Teacher (Primary and Secondary)
 - Principal Teacher (Primary and Secondary Subject)
 - Teacher (Primary, Secondary and ASN)

- Non-Teaching:
 - None

- Child Health:
 - Community General Nursing Services (Bands 7 and 8B)
 - Data Administrator – Family Partnership (Band 4)
 - Dietetics Services (Bands 6 and 7)
 - Dietetic Support Worker
 - Family Nurse (Band 7)
 - FNP Supervisor (Band 8A)
 - General Acute Nursing Services (Band 5)
 - Generic Therapy Service (Band 8B)

- Health Promoting Services (Bands 6 and 7)
 - Health Visitor Nursing Services (Bands 6 and 7)
 - Learning Disabilities Nursing Services (Bands 5, 6 and 7)
 - Mental Health Nursing Services (Band 6)
 - Midwifery Services (Band 7)
 - Occupational Therapy Services (Bands 4, 5, 6 and 7)
 - Office Services (Bands 2 and 3)
 - Paediatric Nursing Services (Bands 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8A)
 - Patient Services (Band 3)
 - PHN School Staff Nurse
 - Physiotherapy Services (Bands 5, 6 and 7)
 - Practice Lead – Disability
 - Practice Lead – Early Years
 - Primary Mental Health Worker
 - Primary Mental Health Worker – Team Lead
 - Public Health Nursing Services (Bands 5, 6 and 7)
 - School Nursing Services (Bands 4, 5, 6 and 7)
 - Specialist Nursing Services (Band 7)
 - Speech & Language Therapy Services (Bands 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8A and 8B)
- NHS Funded Business Support:
 - Secretary
 - Administrative Assistant 1
 - Office Services (Band 3)
 - Clerical Assistant 2
 - Clerical Assistant 1
 - FNP Data Administration Manager

2. Corporate Development

- Customer Services Officer (Service Points only)
- Customer Services Assistant (Service Points only)

3. Community Services

- Waste Collection – Drivers
- Waste Collection – Loaders
- Waste Landfill Site Staff
- Waste Transfer Station Operatives
- Drivers (Winter Maintenance)
- Mechanics
- Burial Grounds Labourers
- Gravediggers
- Crematorium Staff
- Sheltered Housing Wardens

4. Development & Infrastructure

None

5. Finance

None