

## **Assurance & Democratic Services**

### **1. Summary and Background**

- 1.1 The Assurance & Democratic Division (to be called the Corporate Governance Division from 1<sup>st</sup> February) is contributing to the ODI Review of Support Services, with minimum savings of £100,000 in 2011/12 (and overall savings of £300,000).
- 1.2 The divisional budget savings fall within areas of service not subject to ODI. The most significant of these is the Legal Service, with a target for saving £1.032m through a structural review.

In addition it is proposed to conduct a review of the Coronial and Registration service and to receive increased income from citizenship ceremonies of £60,000.

- 1.3 Two budget areas are identified as pressures with the threat of a judicial review regarding the Land Charges service and the need to plan for the cost of un-planned elections.

### **2. Rationale for Savings**

- 2.1 The strategy has been to secure savings by efficiency and by increasing income. The structural review of legal has not yet commenced. The proposals within the budget strategy which will inform the review are to bring externalised specialist work back in house, to reduce employee costs, to decrease accommodation costs, to reduce the use of locums, to increase income through providing legal advice to other councils and to re-align some “legal” work to divisional teams.

### **3. Risk Assessment**

- 3.1 The principal risk is to delivering the savings in legal through a review. This will be kept under review during 2011/12.

### **4. Equality Impact Assessment**

- 4.1 Impact assessments show that the reductions will not disproportionately impact any particular group.
- 4.2 Impact assessments in relation to staffing will be carried out as part of the necessary organisational reviews and redundancy selection procedures to give effect to these savings.

**Perry Holmes**  
**Director of Corporate Governance**  
19 January 2011

**ASSURANCE & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

**BUDGET PROPOSALS 2011/12**

<b>Ref</b>		<b>2011/12 £000</b>	<b>2012/13 £000</b>	<b>2013/14 £000</b>
	<b>Budget Pressures:</b>			
AD1	Land charges judicial review	50.0	50.0	50.0
AD2	Local elections (annualised cost)	50.0	50.0	50.0
	<b>Proposed Savings</b>			
AD3	Legal Services structural review	(1,032.0)	(1,064.0)	(1,064.0)
AD4	Registration Service increased income	(60.0)	(60.0)	(60.0)
	<b>Budget Proposals</b>	<b>(992.0)</b>	<b>(1,024.0)</b>	<b>(1,024.0)</b>

**ASSURANCE & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA – LEGAL SERVICES (LAND CHARGES)</b>		<b>Proposal No: AD1</b>		
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b></p> <p>Reflects changes in the housing market which affect Land Charges ability to generate external income consequent to new legislation.</p>				
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Other				
<b><u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>				
N/A				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
				Date: 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2011
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	2011-12 £000s	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Addition</b>		
Staff	136.5			
Non Staff Costs	32.0	50	50	50
Income	(190.7)			
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>(22.2)</b>	50	50	50
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		3	3	3
Extra post(s) (FTE)		0	0	0

**ASSURANCE & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA – LEGAL SERVICES (ELECTORAL )SERVICES</b>		<b>Proposal No: AD2</b>		
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b></p> <p>The existing budget for the cost of the local elections is insufficient to cover the cost of local elections held every four years. It is current practice to provide an annual contribution to the elections reserve thereby “saving up” for the event itself. However, this amount (£12,000 per annum) is insufficient and has in the past been topped up by year end underspends. It is proposed to put these on a regular footing and reflect the increasing requirements of electoral practice.</p>				
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Decisions already taken/Service Improvement/Other				
<b><u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
				Date: <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1<sup>st</sup> April 2011</span>
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	2011-12 £000s	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Addition</b>		
Staff	193.4			
Non Staff Costs	77.6	50	50	50
Income	(3.6)			
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>267.4</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Extra post(s) (FTE)				

**ASSURANCE & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA : LEGAL SERVICES</b>		<b>Proposal No: AD3</b>		
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b></p> <p>A fundamental review of the Legal Services Division is proposed which will include bringing externalised specialist work back in house, modernising working practices, reducing the use of locums and to increase income through providing legal advice to other external bodies.</p>				
<p><b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b></p> <p>Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other</p>				
<p><b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>The proposal is a significant reduction to the Legal Services budget however the review aims to maintain key services which include the protection of vulnerable children and adults.</p> </div>				
<p><b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b> <span style="float: right;">Date: <input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/></span></p>				
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>		
Staff	3,266	(803)	(823)	(823)
Non Staff Costs	443	(229)	(241)	(241)
Income				
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>3,709</b>	<b>(1,032)</b>	<b>(1,064)</b>	<b>(1,064)</b>
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		85.8	65.1	65.1
Post(s) deleted (FTE) – Includes 2 frozen trainee posts		20.7		
Current vacancies (FTE) – Includes 2 frozen trainee posts		13.2		
Individuals at risk (FTE)		7.5		

## Budget Reduction Equality Impact Assessment

<p><b>Race equality</b></p>	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b></p> <p>Legal Services provide a support service to front line services, many of which provide services to the most vulnerable residents of the City of Leicester.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal is challenging, it will not result in negative impacts experienced: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups</li> <li>• more by one gender and not the other gender</li> <li>• by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)</li> </ul> <p>The proposal will not impact on a particular area of the city, nor will the proposal have a negative impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city.</p>
<p><b>Gender equality</b></p>	
<p><b>Disability equality</b></p>	
<p><b>Community Cohesion</b></p>	



## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> No

# Human Resources

## 1. Summary and Background

- 1.1 The Human Resources Division comprises of the Employment Service Centre, Pay and Workforce Strategy (including Health and Safety), Learning and Development and Strategic Service Partners providing HR services locally. HR is part of the ODI Review of Support Services, and savings of £0.8m are planned in 2013/14. Under the annual CIPFA survey of HR services in unitary authorities, the HR service at Leicester City Council is a top quartile service in terms of value for money in relation to its costs and numbers against similar services in other unitaries.

## 2. Rationale for Savings

- 2.1 The Strategic Service Business Partnering team for Children & Young Peoples Services provides HR services to both schools and non-schools functions. The services to schools are provided on a traded basis with an agreed funding arrangement and currently all city schools buy-in to our in-house HR service. It has been identified that in practice, the cost of services provided to schools is in fact greater than the fee charged and this has caused pressures elsewhere on the Children's Services general fund budget. The direct unit cost of providing this service is £74 per employee. The proposal therefore is to renegotiate the charges to schools for HR services, and this is being undertaken as part of a wider exercise to review trading with schools
- 2.2 Schools are aware that the costs will rise and were given the opportunity last April to withdraw from the traded service. No school withdrew and several chose to re-engage the service having previously used a private provider due to the quality of the service received from the 'in house' HR service compared to the private provider and the hidden additional costs which they were charged by the private provider.
- 2.3 Savings relating to advertising costs are also proposed. This recognises that 90% of job applications are received on-line and the alternative forms of media that are now available to us. Printed jobs bulletins will still be displayed in public buildings and circulated within communities.

## 3. Risk Assessment

- 3.1 The principle risk is one of service take-up by schools. Individual schools do not have to buy support services from in-house provision and therefore have the option of testing the market place for a cheaper option. Clearly there are economies of scale benefits with a large take-up from our own schools, issues of consistency and adherence to Council policy and protection from expensive Employment Tribunal complaints. However, there is a danger that an increase in cost may encourage schools to look elsewhere for the provision of HR support which could lead to loss of income for the Council and redundancies in CYPS HR.

#### **4. Equality Impact Assessment**

- 4.1 The impact assessment shows that the additional charges will not disproportionately impact any particular group.
- 4.2 Should schools opt out of the in-house provision then this will generate redundancies.
- 4.3 The reduction in local media advertising may adversely affect those who do not have easy access to electronic media. As such local facilities will continue to display job vacancies and some further community outlets will also be considered to ensure a high as possible exposure.

**Fiona Skene**  
**Director of Human Resources**  
21 January 2011

**HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**BUDGET PROPOSALS 2011/12**

Ref		2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000
	<b>Proposed Savings</b>			
HR1	HR services traded with schools	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)
HR2	Reduction in job advertising	(26.0)	(26.0)	(26.0)
	<b>Budget Proposals</b>	<b>(126.0)</b>	<b>(126.0)</b>	<b>(126.0)</b>

**HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	<b>Proposal No: HR1</b>			
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b></p> <p>Increased traded income from schools. The current service provision does not fully recover its costs through the existing agreement. Negotiations will be undertaken with schools to ensure the cost of the service provided to them is fully recovered.</p>				
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Decisions already taken, <del>Efficiency</del> , <del>Service Reduction</del> , Other				
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
				Date: <input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs				
Income		(100)	(100)	(100)
<b>Net Total</b>				
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Post(s) deleted (FTE)				
Current vacancies (FTE)				
Individuals at risk (FTE)				

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
<b>Gender equality</b>	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
<b>Disability equality</b>	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No

**HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA : EMPLOYMENT SERVICE CENTRE</b>		<b>Proposal No: HR2</b>			
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b></p> <p>To remove the “sign-post” jobs advert placed weekly to inform the reader how and where to access information relating to vacancies and careers with the Council.</p>					
<p><b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b></p> <p><del>Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other</del></p>					
<p><b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b></p> <p>A saving of £90k was achieved as part of the 2010/11 budget strategy by reducing detailed job advertising. This recognised that 90% of job applications are now received on-line and the rapid growth in accessibility to electronic media. It is now proposed to remove “sign-post” advertising to generate a further saving of £26k per annum.</p> <p>The weekly printed Job Vacancy Bulletin will continue to be printed as these are distributed within the community, libraries, community centres etc</p>					
<p><b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b></p>				<p><b>Date:</b> 1<sup>ST</sup> April 2011</p>	
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs		(26)	(26)	(26)	(26)
Income					
<b>Net Total</b>		(26)	(26)	(26)	(26)
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		0	0	0	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	0	0	
Current vacancies (FTE)		0	0	0	
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0	0	

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> It is not anticipated that there will any disproportional impact on any single racial group. However, there is mitigating action that can be taken to ensure there is no adverse impact on any potential candidate within the city – see the community cohesion section below.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> n/a
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> Analysis of the home location of Council staff shows that city residents come from all wards across the city. Therefore, no one particular area of the city will be disproportionately affected. However, there is mitigating action that can be taken to ensure there is no adverse impact on any potential candidate within the city – see the community cohesion section below.
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> 60% of non-schools Council employees are women. However, as no analysis is available about the source of information on jobs that they have applied for, it is not possible to indicate whether the budget proposal would adversely affect women applicants. However, there is mitigating action that can be taken to ensure there is no adverse impact on any potential candidate within the city – see the community cohesion section below.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> n/a
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> As no analysis is available about the source of information on jobs that they have applied for, it is not possible to indicate whether the budget proposal would adversely affect

	<p>disabled applicants. However, there is mitigating action that can be taken to ensure there is no adverse impact on any potential candidate within the city – see the community cohesion section below.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> n/a</p>
<p><b>Community Cohesion</b></p>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p> <p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> 80% of the Council’s Scale 1-6 staff live in the city, and 22% of employees living in the city come from our most economically deprived areas. It is important that the Council continues to let local people know that jobs are available with the Council. It could produce a simple poster signposting interested applicants to its recruitment website (even signposting people to sources of free internet access) and where paper copies of adverts are available (such as libraries) and post these wherever Council related activities take place, and with partner organisations as well where a community advertising facility is provided. The Learning Disabled Information Communication Network can also be used to signpost disabled applicants to the Council’s recruitment website.</p>

## **Change and Programme Management**

### **1. Summary and Background**

- 1.1 The Change and Programme Management Division currently encompasses the ODI Team, the Corporate Portfolio Management Office which oversees and supports all projects and programmes, and the Partnership Executive Team in the Chief Executive's Office.
- 1.2 The Division will change as a result of the existing Strategic Support Services review which is one of the reviews within the ODI programme. This review includes all officers across the Council who have roles relating to policy work, research and intelligence, strategic planning and partnership support, performance management, equalities policy support, change and programme management. This includes Policy Officers within what was the Chief Executive's Unit as well as officers in similar policy, planning and performance roles within the old departmental structures.
- 1.3 The review is required to deliver a saving of £1m and is currently targeted to deliver £1.07m which is a 36% saving on the costs of the existing structures. The review will bring together all of this support into one consolidated structure and divert the focus of some of the resource into capacity to deliver the ODI work on an ongoing basis. The review has taken account of what is needed to deliver all of this type of work in a smaller Council overall in the future, with a streamlined Leicester Partnership structure that has now been agreed, and taking into account the changes in terms of support that might be needed for changed governance and management arrangements. The review is currently at the slotting in stage and is due to complete by the end of February, so that the majority of savings can be achieved from early in the new financial year.
- 1.4 Outside of the ODI review, the divisional budget savings relate to a reduction in the community cohesion fund. The fund directly supports the City's community cohesion strategy which in itself contributes to the One Leicester priority relating to creating thriving and safe communities. The Community Cohesion fund is allocated both to organisations such as the Race Equality Centre and Gujarat Hindu Association, and to specific projects and activities. The overall fund will be reduced by £64,300 in 2011/12, from a total of £241,200 in 2010/11 to £176,900.

### **2. Rationale for Savings**

- 2.1 The savings will still leave a sufficient level of funding to support key priorities relating to the community cohesion strategy.

### **3. Risk Assessment**

- 3.1 The principal risk is being able to deliver against the outcomes of the community cohesion strategy. The reduction in community cohesion funding for specific projects and activities will mean that there will need to be a robust and evidence based approach in terms of prioritising

which activities and projects to support. This will be based on evidence of need relating to the outcomes in the strategy.

#### **4. Equality Impact Assessment**

- 4.1 Impact assessments show that the reductions should not disproportionately impact any particular group.

**Miranda Cannon**

**Director of Change and Programme Management**

20 January 2011

**CHANGE & PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT**

**BUDGET PROPOSALS 2011/12**

<b>Ref</b>		<b>2011/12 £000</b>	<b>2012/13 £000</b>	<b>2013/14 £000</b>
	<b>Proposed Savings</b>			
CPM1	Community Cohesion fund reduction	(64.3)	(64.3)	(64.3)
	<b>Budget Proposals</b>	<b>(64.3)</b>	<b>(64.3)</b>	<b>(64.3)</b>

**CHANGE & PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA: Community Cohesion</b>		<b>Proposal No: CPM1</b>		
<b>Purpose of Service</b>				
<p>The purpose of the community cohesion fund is to support delivery of the Community Cohesion strategy for the city. Community Cohesion is about all communities. Through 'Community Cohesion' work we are aiming to achieve five improvements or 'outcomes' in Leicester:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different communities get on well together - Bringing different communities together to build bridges, understanding and respect between them through meaningful engagement.</li> <li>• New communities bond together. - Helping new communities to grow and bond together to help them build self-help, identity and roots.</li> <li>• Everyone in Leicester feels they belong - Helping people in Leicester to feel at home and to see our diversity as strength to be enjoyed.</li> <li>• Young people understand and respect different communities, and adults and young people get on well together - Supporting children and young people to develop understanding and respect for different communities, and helping to build good relationships between young people and adults in the city.</li> <li>• There is freedom from tension - Addressing tensions and the causes of tension between and within communities in the city.</li> </ul> <p>These outcomes are set out in the Council's community cohesion strategy. Leicester is proud of its reputation for community cohesion. Much of this reputation has come about because of the work that many voluntary and community groups do in the city to bring different communities together, to build understanding, respect and enjoyment and help us become One Leicester.</p>				
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>				
<p>The Community Cohesion fund is allocated both to organisations such as the Race Equality Centre, and Gujarat Hindu Association, and to specific projects and activities. Funding for the Race Equality Centre and Gujarat Hindu Association will remain at the contracted level in 2011/12 of £70,000 and £30,000 respectively. The overall fund will be reduced by £64,300 in 2011/12, from a total of £241,200 in 2010/11 to £176,900.</p>				
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</b>				
Other – reduced funding to commission specific projects and activities.				
<b>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</b>				
<p>The fund directly supports the City's community cohesion strategy which in itself contributes to the One Leicester priority relating to creating thriving and safe communities. The reduction in funding will mean that careful prioritisation will be required in relation to the types of projects and activities that are funded, for example to help mitigate against specific community tensions which are monitored via our joint tension monitoring with the Police, and to support specific communities and areas of the city informed by our overall needs analysis across the city.</p>				
<b>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</b>				
Date: 01/04/11				
<b>Financial Implications of Proposal</b>	<b>2010-11</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2011-12</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2012-13</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2013-14</b> <b>£000s</b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>		
Staff	n/a	n/a		
Non Staff Costs	241.2	(64.3)	(64.3)	(64.3)
Income				
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>241.2</b>	<b>(64.3)</b>	<b>(64.3)</b>	<b>(64.3)</b>
<b>Staffing Implications – no staffing implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Post(s) deleted (FTE)				
Current vacancies (FTE)				
Individuals at risk (FTE)				

# Budget Equality Impact Assessment

<p><b>Race equality</b></p>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b></p> <p>Maintaining cohesive communities is important to Leicester. Community Cohesion is about all communities. It is not just about relationships between different ethnic groups. Segregation, misunderstanding and tension can occur between all sorts of communities, for example between young and old, or between different neighbourhoods. Through 'Community Cohesion' work we are aiming to achieve five improvements or 'outcomes' in Leicester:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different communities get on well together - Bringing different communities together to build bridges, understanding and respect between them through meaningful engagement.</li> <li>• New communities bond together. - Helping new communities to grow and bond together to help them build self-help, identity and roots.</li> <li>• Everyone in Leicester feels they belong - Helping people in Leicester to feel at home and to see our diversity as strength to be enjoyed.</li> <li>• Young people understand and respect different communities, and adults and young people get on well together - Supporting children and young people to develop understanding and respect for different communities, and helping to build good relationships between young people and adults in the city.</li> <li>• There is freedom from tension - Addressing tensions and the causes of tension between and within communities in the city.</li> </ul> <p>The community cohesion fund has previously funded a wide range of projects and activities within and across different communities within the city. A reduction should not disproportionately impact on a specific racial group or other equality group.</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>The reduction in community cohesion funding for specific projects and activities will mean that there will need to be a robust and evidence based approach in terms of prioritising which activities and projects to support. This will be based on evidence of need relating to the outcomes set out above.</p>
	<p>If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?</p> <p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b></p>

	<p>The reduction in community cohesion funding for specific projects and activities will mean that there will need to be a robust and evidence based approach in terms of prioritising which activities and projects to support. This will be based on evidence of need relating to the outcomes set out above.</p>
<b>Gender equality</b>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b></p> <p>As set out above</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>As set out above</p>
<b>Disability equality</b>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>As set out above</p>
	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>As set out above</p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>As set out above</p>

## **Information and Support Services**

### **1. Summary and Background**

- 1.1 The Information and Support Services Division comprises Customer Services and ICT Services. ICT Services is part of the ODI Review of Support Services, and savings of £0.7m are planned in 2011/12 rising to £1.4 in 2012/13.
- 1.2 Customer Services comprises the NWC Customer Service Centre (CSC); four neighbourhood based CSCs and a corporate telephone call centre. The Customer Services savings of £156,000 from 2011/12 fall entirely in the corporate telephone call centre. The majority of Customer Services budget is staffing.

### **2. Rationale for Savings**

- 2.1 In response to customer feedback, Customer Services extended the operating hours of the corporate call centre to 8 am – 8pm Monday – Saturday during 2009. In practice call numbers after 6pm and on a Saturday have been relatively modest with 98% of all calls being received between 8am and 6pm Monday - Friday. It is proposed that the opening hours are reduced to 8am – 6pm Monday – Friday. Callers to the call centre outside of these core hours will be greeted with a recorded message encouraging them to refer to the council's web site where increasing numbers of council services are now available on-line.

### **3. Risk Assessment**

- 3.1 The principle risk is one of reduced customer satisfaction however the risk is considered to be low as the revised opening hours are still extended beyond a standard working day. Furthermore only 2% of current calls are received outside of these revised core hours.

### **4. Equality Impact Assessment**

- 4.1 The impact assessment shows that the reductions will not disproportionately impact any particular group.
- 4.2 No redundancies are anticipated as the service area has been carrying a number of vacancies in anticipation of cuts.

**Jill Craig**  
**Director Information and Support**  
19 January 2011

**INFORMATION AND SUPPORT SERVICES**

**BUDGET PROPOSALS 2011/12**

<b>Ref</b>		<b>2011/12 £000</b>	<b>2012/13 £000</b>	<b>2013/14 £000</b>
	<b>Proposed Savings</b>			
IS1	Customer services call centre	(156.0)	(156.0)	(156.0)
	<b>Budget Proposals</b>	<b>(156.0)</b>	<b>(156.0)</b>	<b>(156.0)</b>

**INFORMATION AND SUPPORT SERVICES**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA Customer Services</b>		<b>Proposal No: IS1</b>			
<b><i>Purpose of Service</i></b>					
Providing a single point of access to Leicester City Council's services. Resolving 95% of all inquiries in one contact.					
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce Customer Services Line operating hours to 8am – 6pm Mon – Fri (currently 8-8 Mon – Sat) (£156k)</li> </ul>					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>					
Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>					
<p>We may see a fall in customer satisfaction as a result of a reduction in the opening hours of the Call Centre although 98% of calls to the centre are made between 8 am – 6pm Monday to Friday so the impact will be limited.</p> <p>When the Call Centre is closed callers are referred to the council's web site. As more services are moved on-line then an increasing percentage of enquiries will be resolved without the need for the customer to call or visit the council.</p>					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>					
Date: CSL reduced hours : 1 <sup>st</sup> May 2011					
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>		<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff	1,956.5	(156)	(156)	(156)	
Non Staff Costs	224.0				
Income	(61.5)				
<b>Net Total</b>	2,119.0	(156)	(156)	(156)	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		72			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		7			
Current vacancies (FTE)		7			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0			

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No

## Financial Services

### 1. Summary and Background

- 1.1 Most of the Financial Services Division is part of the ODI Review of Support Services, and savings of £1.2m per annum are planned in 2011/12.
- 1.2 The divisional budget savings fall within areas of service not subject to ODI. The most significant of these is the Revenues and Benefits Service, with a total gross budget of £8.7m. The remaining divisions are small by comparison:
  - (a) Audit (£0.8m);
  - (b) Risk Management (£0.3m).

### 2. Rationale for Savings

- 2.1 The strategy has been to secure savings by efficiency wherever possible, and to enable the Revenues and Benefits Service to continue to deliver the performance expectations of the Revenues and Benefits Improvement Plan.
- 2.2 In the context of Revenues and Benefits, savings in 2011/12 are proposed in respect of management costs, reductions in overtime, and closure of the current facility for members of the public to pay rent/council tax in the city centre. The latter is consistent with the growth of Paypoint, whereby a large network of shops and other facilities exists to make payments. It is also consistent with proposals in the HRA budget to close in-house cash payment facilities. Savings in 2011/12 safeguard the aim of protecting improvement plan targets: now the service is largely up-to-date it is easier to stay that way.
- 2.3 Revenues and Benefits will be greatly affected by the proposed introduction of the universal tax credit. Savings have been proposed for 2012/13 which would require implementation planning in 2011/12, but these will be reviewed in the light of better information about the universal credit. The universal credit will also involve transfer of some responsibility to Central Government, and the localisation of the scheme of council tax benefit. The most significant element of the proposed 2012/13 savings is the use of postal returns to collect evidence of circumstances rather than visiting officers, in line with most authorities practices; and a reduction in customer liaison work.
- 2.4 In respect of Audit, the strategy has been to reduce externalisation of work and to make staffing reductions consistent with levels in the Support Services Review. Audit will become part of a joint Internal Audit Service with the County Council, and these efficiency savings will be achieved in advance of this.
- 2.5 Risk Management will make the most significant elements of its savings by bringing in-house claims handling work currently done externally.

### **3. Risk Assessment**

- 3.1 The principle risk is to the delivery of the Benefits Improvement Plan, particularly if caseloads start to increase significantly. For this reason, no reductions in operational staffing levels are proposed in either 2011/12 or 2012/13. It is not believed that the 2011/12 savings will impact the improvement plan. 2012/13 will be kept under review, but some reduction in service will start to be left if the proposed reductions are implemented.
- 3.2 There are risks in reducing audit staffing, in that reduced audit coverage could mean that problems go undetected for a longer period of time. The shared service is intended to give greater responsiveness to the internal audit service as a whole.

### **4. Equality Impact Assessment**

- 4.1 Impact assessments show that the reductions will not disproportionately impact any particular group.
- 4.2 Impact assessments in relation to staffing will be carried out as part of the necessary organisational reviews and redundancy selection procedures to give effect to these savings.

**Mark Noble**  
**Chief Finance Officer**  
4 February 2011

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**  
**BUDGET PROPOSALS 2011/12**

Ref		2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000
	<b>Budget Pressures:</b>			
FS1	HB & CT Admin grant reduction	250.0	250.0	250.0
	<b>Proposed Savings</b>			
FS2	Internal Audit shared service	(80.0)	(105.0)	(105.0)
FS3	Risk Management claims administration	(126.0)	(146.0)	(146.0)
FS4	Revenues & Benefits service review	(337.0)	(671.0)	(671.0)
	<b>Budget Proposals</b>	<b>(293.0)</b>	<b>(672.0)</b>	<b>(672.0)</b>

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA : REVENUES &amp; BENEFITS</b>		<b>Proposal No: FS1</b>		
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b>          Following the CSR grant announcements in Oct '10 the service has seen a disproportionate reduction in its government administration grant by 14% in the first year. A reduction of this levy was not anticipated to this extent and cannot be met within the current budget provisions in addition to savings already identified for 2011/12.</p>				
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Other				
<b><u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				Date: 1/4/2011
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	2011-12 £000s	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Addition</b>		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs				
Income		250	250	250
<b>Net Total</b>		250	250	250
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Extra post(s) (FTE)		0		

**FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	<b>INTERNAL AUDIT</b>	<b>Proposal No: FS2</b>			
<b><i>Purpose of Service</i></b> To ensure the Council's finances are effectively managed.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b></p> <p>Reduction of the internal Audit service. These savings will be made in advance of the creation of a shared internal audit service with the County Council.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b></p> <p>Reduction of the internal Audit service. These savings will be made in advance of the creation of a shared internal audit service with the County Council.</p>
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b></p> <p>Reduction of the internal Audit service. These savings will be made in advance of the creation of a shared internal audit service with the County Council.</p>					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>					
Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>Reduced Audit Plan / coverage and reduced capacity to respond to commissioned and other reactive work. £10,000 of the reduction is a reduction in external work (contract audit) which will be carried out in-house. The balance primarily relates to staffing. The service has a further pressure in relation to the Government's recent cessation of the Financial Management Standard in schools which was previously met by the Schools' Forum.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p>Reduced Audit Plan / coverage and reduced capacity to respond to commissioned and other reactive work. £10,000 of the reduction is a reduction in external work (contract audit) which will be carried out in-house. The balance primarily relates to staffing. The service has a further pressure in relation to the Government's recent cessation of the Financial Management Standard in schools which was previously met by the Schools' Forum.</p>
<p>Reduced Audit Plan / coverage and reduced capacity to respond to commissioned and other reactive work. £10,000 of the reduction is a reduction in external work (contract audit) which will be carried out in-house. The balance primarily relates to staffing. The service has a further pressure in relation to the Government's recent cessation of the Financial Management Standard in schools which was previously met by the Schools' Forum.</p>					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>					
				Date: <input type="text"/>	
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff	758.2	(60)	(85)	(85)	
Non Staff Costs	19.6	(13)	(13)	(13)	
Income	(103.2)	(7)	(7)	(7)	
<b>Net Total</b>		(80)	(105)	(105)	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		21			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		2.5			
Current vacancies (FTE)		1			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		1.5			

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
<b>Gender equality</b>	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
<b>Disability equality</b>	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No

**FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA – Risk Management and Insurance Services</b>		<b>Proposal No: FS3</b>			
<i><b>Purpose of Service ; To provide a support function to all Officers and Members of the Council in relation to their responsibilities to identify and control risks to the Council's activities; to ensure Business Continuity through any interruptions to service; and to manage the Council's insurance requirements and portfolio.</b></i>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b></p> <p>Bring in house the handling of Personal Injury claims saving an eventual £90K per annum in fees and a reduction in business continuity and risk management staff.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b></p> <p>Bring in house the handling of Personal Injury claims saving an eventual £90K per annum in fees and a reduction in business continuity and risk management staff.</p>
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b></p> <p>Bring in house the handling of Personal Injury claims saving an eventual £90K per annum in fees and a reduction in business continuity and risk management staff.</p>					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>					
Decisions already taken, Efficiency, Service Reduction, Other					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>All future risk or business continuity support or guidance sought will be handled by one person until additional training can be delivered to the rest of the team (2012/13 earliest). It is not anticipated that the organisation will experience a diminution of service.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p>All future risk or business continuity support or guidance sought will be handled by one person until additional training can be delivered to the rest of the team (2012/13 earliest). It is not anticipated that the organisation will experience a diminution of service.</p>
<p>All future risk or business continuity support or guidance sought will be handled by one person until additional training can be delivered to the rest of the team (2012/13 earliest). It is not anticipated that the organisation will experience a diminution of service.</p>					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				1 <sup>st</sup> April 2011	
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> £000s	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> £000s	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> £000s	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> £000s	
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff	324.6	(66)	(66)	(66)	
Non Staff Costs	6.7	(60)	(80)	(80)	
Income	(309.6)	0	0	0	
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>(126)</b>	<b>(146)</b>	<b>(146)</b>	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		9.6	9.6	9.6	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1.6	1.6	1.6	
Current vacancies (FTE)		0	0	0	
Individuals at risk (FTE)		2	2	2	

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
<b>Gender equality</b>	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
<b>Disability equality</b>	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> No

**FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA Revenues &amp; Benefits</b>	<b>Proposal No: FS4</b>			
<b><i>Purpose of Service:</i></b> Statutory provision. The collection of council tax for the authority and non-domestic rates on behalf of the Government. The administration of Housing and Council Tax benefit and the Discretionary Housing Payment fund on behalf of the Government. The service has successfully run an improvement programme during 09/10 and 10/11.				
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> The revenues and benefits service has a 2 year saving programme, as we need to start work in 11/12 to give effect to savings needed for 12/13. However, given the substantial changes expected in benefits and the introduction of universal credit, 12/13 proposals remain fluid and will be revisited. 11/12 proposals include:- - the closure of the current cashiering facility in the city centre for external payments. The public can now use PayPoint in shops across the city to pay rent and council tax. Housing payment facilities are also closing; - management reductions, deletion of vacant posts, savings in supplies & services/overtime. The key indicative proposal in respect of 12/13 is to rely on using postal forms to collect evidence and reduce visiting officers, and a small dedicated liaison team is proposed to be disbanded but this is likely to require modification in light of national changes.				
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Efficiency				
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>				
Collection rates are maintained and the administration of benefits continues to meet its improvement plan targets in 11/12.				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
				<b>Date:</b> <input style="width: 100px;" type="text" value="01/05/11"/>
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>		
Staff	6,683.1	(337)	(671)	(671)
Non Staff Costs	2,067.1			
Income	(5,497.7)			
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>3,252.7</b>	<b>(337)</b>	<b>(671)</b>	<b>(671)</b>
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		228		
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		9	10	
Current vacancies (FTE)		4	0	
Individuals at risk (FTE) *		5	10	

\* there is a high level of constant staff churn in the Revenues & Benefits Service

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> <b>A diverse and varied client group accesses the service provision affected by the budget reduction. No one group uses or does not use the facility. All parties will be affected proportionately.</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? There are alternative methods of payment available for charge payers either pay on line through the internet or pay point. Pay point sites are spread across the city at post offices, co-op's etc with easy access and with extended opening hours beyond the current provision. Publicity promoting the pay point sites will be circulated at annual billing to alter as many users as possible to alternative payment methods.</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: No</b>
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	Your assessment of impact/risk: A diverse and varied client group accesses the service provision affected by the budget reduction. There is an even usage of the facility by gender it is therefore not envisaged to affect one gender group above another.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk. There are alternative methods of payment at local sites through pay point or through the internet where the usual DDA adjustments can be applied for ease of access..</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk. No the provision is located centrally and is not fundamental to community cohesion and it is not anticipated it will exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city</b>