

# Corporate Affairs Overview & Scrutiny Panel

Date: **Wednesday 18 November 2009**  
Time: **10.00am**  
Venue: **Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich**

**Persons attending the meeting are requested to turn off mobile phones.**

## **Membership**

Mr C Jordan (Chairman)

Mr M Brindle  
Mr J Carswell  
Mr S Clancy  
Mrs D Clarke  
Mr B Collins  
Mr J Dobson  
Mr S Dorrington  
Mr R Hanton  
Mr M Hemsley  
Mr M Langwade  
Ms J Mickleburgh  
Mr A Proctor (Vice Chairman)  
Mr R Smith  
Mrs J Toms  
Mrs C Walker  
Mr A White

## **Cabinet Members (Non-Voting)**

Mr B Borrett Corporate Affairs & Efficiency  
Mr I Mackie Finance and Performance

## **Deputy Cabinet Members (Non-Voting)**

Mr J Herbert Human Resources

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda  
please contact the Committee Administrator:**

Vanessa Dobson on 01603 223029  
or email [vanessa.dobson@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:vanessa.dobson@norfolk.gov.uk)

## **A g e n d a**

1. **To receive apologies and details of any substitute members attending.**
2. **Minutes**  
**To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 23 September 2009**

(Page **1**)

3. **Members to Declare any Interests**

Please indicate whether the interest is a personal one only or one which is prejudicial. A declaration of a personal interest should indicate the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of a personal interest, the member may speak and vote on the matter. Please note that if you are exempt from declaring a personal interest because it arises solely from your position on a body to which you were nominated by the County Council or a body exercising functions of a public nature (e.g. another local authority), you need only declare your interest if and when you intend to speak on a matter.

If a prejudicial interest is declared, the member should withdraw from the room whilst the matter is discussed unless members of the public are allowed to make representations, give evidence or answer questions about the matter, in which case you may attend the meeting for that purpose. You must immediately leave the room when you have finished or the meeting decides you have finished, if earlier.

These declarations apply to all those members present, whether the member is part of the meeting, attending to speak as a local member on an item or simply observing the meeting from the public seating area.

4. **To receive any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency**

5. **Public Question Time**

15 minutes for questions from members of the public of which due notice has been given.

Please note that all questions must be received by 5pm on Friday 13 November 2009. Please submit your question(s) to the person named on the front of this agenda. For guidance on submitting public questions, please view the Council Constitution, Appendix 10, Council Procedure Rules at [www.norfolk.gov.uk/reviewpanelquestions](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/reviewpanelquestions).

6. **Local Member Issues/Member Questions**

15 minutes for local members to raise issues of concern of which due notice has been given.

Please note that all questions must be received by 5pm on Friday 13 November 2009. Please submit your question(s) to the person named on the front of this agenda.

7. **Cabinet Member Feedback on Previous Overview & Scrutiny Panel Comments (if any)**

**Items for Scrutiny**

8. **Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership (LSP)** (Page **11**)  
Report by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development which provides Members with the results of the questionnaire completed for the Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership (LSP).
9. **Shared Services** (Page **25**)  
Report by the Director of Corporate Resources and Cultural Services which provides Members with a draft Terms of Reference for the new scrutiny topic looking at shared services.
10. **Forward Work Programme: Scrutiny** (Page **28**)  
Report by the Director of Corporate Resources and Cultural Services which asks Members to review and develop the programme for scrutiny.

**Items for Overview**

11. **Compliments and Complaints during 2008/09** (Page **35**)  
Report by the Head of Democratic Services which presents the number and spread of Corporate Compliments and Complaints dealt with by the Council in the period 2008/09, together with information on Freedom of Information enquiries and complaints.
12. **Performance and Resources Monitoring Report** (Page **45**)  
Report by the Director of Corporate Resources and Cultural Services which includes an update on performance and financial monitoring information.
13. **Service and Budget Planning 2010-13** (Page **55**)  
Report by the Director of Corporate Resources and Cultural Services and the Head of Finance which sets out the main planning considerations for the services covered by the Panel and the context in which they are set.
14. **Corporate Health & Safety Mid-Year Report for 2008/2009** (Page **72**)  
Report by the Corporate Health & Safety Manager which provides information on the Corporate Health and Safety Plan.

15. **Risk Management within Norfolk County Council and the Departments of Chief Executives and Corporate Finance** (Page **84**)  
Report by the Chief Executive, Director of Corporate Resources and Cultural Services and the Head of Corporate Finance which provides an update on the approach being undertaken to manage risk within the services that report to this Panel, as well as corporately across the authority.
16. **ICT Plan 2010/11** (Page **104**)  
Report by the Director of Corporate Resources and Cultural Services which summarises the key aspects of the ICT Plan 2010/11.

<b>Group Meetings</b>		
<b>Conservative</b>	<b>9.00am</b>	<b>Colman Room</b>
<b>Green Party</b>	<b>9.00am</b>	<b>Room 532</b>
<b>Liberal Democrat</b>	<b>9.00am</b>	<b>Room 504</b>

**Chris Walton**  
**Head of Democratic Services**

County Hall  
Martineau Lane  
Norwich  
NR1 2DH

Date Agenda Published: 10 November 2009



If you need this Agenda in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Vanessa Dobson 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

## **Corporate Affairs Overview & Scrutiny Panel**

### **Minutes of the Meeting Held on 23 September 2009**

**Present:**

Mr M Brindle	Mr M Langwade
Mr S Clancy	Ms J Mickleburgh
Mrs D Clarke	Mr A Proctor
Mr J Dobson	Mr R Smith
Mr R Hanton	Ms J Toms
Mr M Hemsley	Mr A White
Mr C Jordan	

**Substitute Members Present:**

Mrs D Irving

**Cabinet Members Present:**

Mr A Williams	Corporate & Commercial Services
Mrs J Chamberlin	Partnerships and Performance

**Deputy Cabinet Members Present:**

Mr J Herbert	Corporate Affairs and Human Resources
Mr B Borrett	Efficiency

**Also in attendance:**

Cllr S Woodbridge	Leader of Broadland District Council
Ms L Mowl	Head of Policy, Broadland District Council
Ms K De Vries	Co-ordinator, Broadland Community Partnership

**1. Apologies**

Apologies were received from Mr J Carswell, Mr B Collins (Mrs D Irving substituted), Mr S Dorrington and Mrs C Walker.

**2. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2009 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the following amendment:

Paragraph 10.3: Mrs Chamberlin, Cabinet Member for Partnerships and Performance would report further information concerning where people were less assured to the 18 November meeting, not the 23 September meeting as stated.

**3. Declarations of Interest**

Mr A Proctor declared a personal interest in Item 8, Broadland Community Partnership, as a member of Broadland District Council.

Mrs J Chamberlin declared a personal interest in Item 8, Broadland Community Partnership, as the Norfolk County Council member on the Broadland Local Strategic Partnership.

**4. Matters of Urgent Business**

There were no matters of urgent business.

**5. Public Question Time**

There were no public questions.

**6. Local Member Issues**

There were no local member issues.

**7. Cabinet Member Feedback on Previous Review Panel Comments**

In her new role as Cabinet Member for Partnerships and Performance, Mrs Chamberlin informed members that she had attended several partnership meetings and had been received in a very positive and friendly manner. She said that the position of Cabinet Member for Partnerships and Performance formed an important link between the partnerships.

**8. Broadland Community Partnership**

8.1 The Panel received the annexed report (8) by the Head of Policy and Performance which set out the results of the questionnaire looking at the Broadland Community Partnership (BCP), the local strategic partnership for the Broadland area.

8.2 Councillor Simon Woodbridge the Leader of Broadland District Council (BDC), together with Liz Mowl, Head of Policy and Ms K De Vries, BCP Co-ordinator, attended the meeting and gave a presentation on the BCP (attached at Appendix A).

8.3 Following the presentation a question and answer session ensued during which the following was noted:

8.3.1 Councillor Woodbridge explained that the level of partnership funding under-spend by the BCP had been due to the rigorous evaluation processes in place to ensure funding was allocated where it was most needed. Currently, there were many projects that could benefit from the funding but due to the current significant global financial situation, the decision had been taken to undertake rigorous evaluations of each proposal. Most of the funding under-spend would be allocated to projects by the end of the year. The BCP had also received £0.5M funding from the Central Government for a family support centre. Members acknowledged that the under-spend did not represent a lack of activity or of aspiration on the part of the BCP.

8.3.2 Councillor Woodbridge noted that the allocation of Second Homes money to the district councils could change in the future.

8.3.3 Members noted that the partnership questionnaire advised that the BCP was complex and Councillor Woodbridge confirmed that this was the case. The Partnership Strategy and Action Plan is based around nine vision themes (as listed in Appendix A) as a conduit to enable all partners, for example the police or the Learning and Skills Council (LSC), to become involved but to ensure that partners do not waste time on projects where their expertise is not required. Current projects included:

- **Fit for Learning, Fit for Life:** (first joint BDC, City of Norwich and South Norfolk Alliance project) to support the homeless by offering training to hostel staff
- **Broadland Community Bank:** the Local Strategic Partnership's (LSP) funding of £10,000 kick-started the roll out of a credit union within Broadland.
- **Housing Adaptations Project:** BCP funding added value to a BDC project to reduce the complexity in processing Disabled Facilities Grant awards.
- **Stairway pilot projects - YBYz and Respectful Relations and Bully Richard:** the projects raised awareness of domestic violence and issues such as bullying. Young people gained awareness of issues and debated coping mechanisms.
- **Sanctuary Project:** support for victims of domestic violence to stay in their own homes.
- **YMCA Homelessness Worker:** BCP's input into what had been a BDC and YMCA part-time project allowed for much stronger monitoring and evaluation procedures which it is hoped will allow the project to approach Children's Services for future funding.
- **County Wildlife Site review:** BCP paid for a review of County wildlife sites not visited since 1995
- **BCP Small Grants Programme:** offers up to £500 to local community projects – between 9 and 11 projects supported annually across the whole of Broadland.
- **Broadland Link Up Project:** to increase the two way flow of information between community groups and the BCP. To be achieved by supporting community groups in consultation activity and by funding events which raise the profile and celebrate the diversity of communities within Broadland, for example the Taste of Broadland event at the Thorpe St Andrew Summer Festival.
- **Taverham Help Shop:** financial support for a local venue offering advice on all areas (50% of advice around debt).
- **Vulnerable People's Project:** making use of existing Adult Social Services staff to deliver key BCP partner messages to the vulnerable and elderly.

8.3.4 Feedback and follow up from 'YBYz' Magic Show suggested that young people were influenced by attending the show. A six-month evaluation suggested that the Show also had a long term value.

- 8.3.5 Value is added to the projects due to the partnership environment. For example, BDC had responsibility for the housing Adaptations project. Previously, there would be a triangle of activity between Adult Social Services, NCC and Broadland District Council but by working in partnership this had been devolved to a district level which allows Broadland District Council to be much more responsive. This project has also funded bathing equipment so that it could be trialled by the client prior to purchase – and importantly offered the same service to those who were ineligible – making it more likely that satisfied clients would make the necessary private purchases.
- 8.3.6 The Small Grants Programme encourages communities to find solutions to their own problems.
- 8.3.7 A Care and Repair scheme to enable older people living alone in private housing to receive small repairs to their properties could also be considered to play an important role in the Community Partnership context as it acts as an ‘eyes and ears’ alert for Adult Social Services when problems arise due to elderly people living alone. There is a very strong team of people who come up with new ways to deal with issues and who use lateral thinking to add value to the Strategic Partnership.
- 8.3.8 The Partnership does investigate ‘green spaces’ link to its priorities in the following ways:
- By considering what deployment of green space is required to provide ‘pride in place’.
  - In terms of green corridors, to allow people to cycle into work.
  - In terms of food production, the impact on landscape and how green spaces are to be protected in growth areas.
  - Green spaces are about biodiversity and Broadland District Council has launched an initiative ‘Save Broadland Bumblebees’ which if not taken seriously could lead to a serious threat to food production.
- 8.4 Members offered their congratulations to Councillor Woodbridge and the officers concerned for their enthusiasm and commitment to the Community Partnership which shined through the presentation.
- 8.5 Councillor Woodbridge voiced concern that whilst the County Strategic Partnership has responsibility for bringing together all information for the Local Area Agreement, this information could be better used at district level. BCP could offer a unique opportunity to test and trial projects in the Broadland context and would welcome the opportunity to trial key projects.
- 8.6 The Chairman thanked Councillor Woodbridge and his team for their very interesting and informative presentation.

**Resolved:**

- 8.7 Members confirmed that the scrutiny of the BCP was now complete and that the Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership would be the next partnership to undergo the scrutiny process.



## **9. Forward Work Programme: Scrutiny**

- 9.1 Members considered the outline programme for scrutiny which had been updated to show progress since the 22 July 2009 meeting.
- 9.2 It was noted that a risk management presentation had taken place in March 2008 and further risk management training for Members was being offered on 24 and 28 September and 13 October. This was a very important issue and Members were encouraged to attend one of the training sessions. Mr Adams said that if enough Members expressed an interest, evening training sessions could be arranged or alternatively, if training was required for one or two members, then a meeting could be arranged with the officer concerned.
- 9.3 Members suggested that if they are unable to attend a training session then comprehensive information should be made available to them. Various ways of making this information available were suggested, including via Members Insight but some twin-hatters stated that they could not gain access to this site via their district council supplied IT equipment.

### **Resolved:**

- 9.4 Following discussion it was agreed that the following scrutiny topics should be added to the forward work programme:
- i) Freedom of Information enquiries and complaints - officer time spent providing information and other related costs (to include the number of people who habitually make FOI requests and the costs incurred). This information should be included as part of the 'Compliments and Complaints Report' to be presented at the 18 November meeting.
  - ii) A brief review report on making NCC's ICT systems greener.
  - iii) To examine the framework that this Council uses to deliver shared services (both internally and with other Councils) to ensure it is robust.

## **10. Performance and Resources Monitoring Report**

- 10.1 Members received and considered the annexed report (10) which included an update on performance and financial monitoring information.
- 10.2 Members heard that the Audit Commission had widened the scope of the assessment to look at how the authority uses resources across the organisation and the Use of Resources assessment achieved a level 3 score which meant the authority was 'performing well' – a good result.
- 10.3 There was still some uncertainty surrounding the amount recoverable from the Icelandic Banks as the administration process was not complete and it would take some time to resolve. The legal costs to be incurred by the authority as part of the winding-up process were quite small and these would be reported to the next Cabinet. These legal costs would be included as part of the authority's claim to the administrators.
- 10.4 Members noted that the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter figure for the total number of employees declaring a disability under the DDA definition was 2.09% and that this remained a key area for improvement over the coming year. Detailed analysis was made available on an annual basis as part of the Workforce Profile report received annually by the Panel. Further information, including

details of the action being taken to improve in this area could be provided on request.

- 10.5 The target for the total of orders raised through i-procurement was £135m for 2009-10. This did not represent any cash savings as it was more about standardizing systems of ordering to increase efficiency. It was suggested that the authority should simplify the process of efficiency and savings on a portfolio basis which would show actual savings. Members heard that the November meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Panels would receive budget proposals for 2010-11 and these would broadly be shown by portfolio.
- 10.6 The consultation process underway with religious and belief groups and lesbian, gay and bisexual people in Norfolk was being undertaken to provide information which would help the Council ensure that its services are inclusive of all people who live and work in Norfolk. There had been a good response to the consultation which had been extended.
- 10.7 With reference to paragraph 3.2, the Revenue Budget Outturn 2009-2010, Adjusted Budget included movements since the County Council approved the budget. Members heard that Government guidance had stated that the authority does not have to budget for the Iceland Bank losses incurred until 2010-2011. However, the loss of interest incurred as part of the Iceland Bank losses had been reflected in the 2008-09 accounts. In terms the Adjusted Budget, this related to movements since the budget was set by the authority.

## **11. Efficiency Programme**

- 11.1 Members received and considered the annexed report (11) which provided a review of progress against the Council's 2009-2010 efficiency targets.
- 11.2 Energy costs had risen due in part because of the volatility of the energy markets and also the extended school and library opening hours which had led to increased energy usage. Mr Williams advised that the authority had saved £16m in the last year by purchasing its energy through ESPO.
- 11.3 The Head of Efficiency agreed to arrange for Dominic Allan, Sustainability Manager, to provide a response to Ms Toms as to how the authority's carbon footprint is calculated

The meeting closed at 11.55am.

## **Chairman**



If you need this Agenda in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Vanessa Dobson 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

## Appendix A



### Broadland Community Partnership

**NCC Overview & Scrutiny  
23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009**

**Cllr Simon Woodbridge**



*... leading the way*

## Broadland Portrait

### Place Survey Results

- Satisfaction with the local area has improved from 91% to 94%, the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest district in the country
- 68% of residents feel safe after dark: 95% feel safe during the day
- 84% feel people from different backgrounds get on well together
- 4 in 5 residents say their health is good - 79%



*... leading the way*

## BCP Portrait

- **Strategic Board**  
(15 active partners with 4 supporting agencies who attend for specific issues)
- **Operational MAST** - Multi-Agency Support Team  
(12 active partners, with thematic champion support for specific issues)
- **Thematic Champions** for our 9 vision themes
- **Action owners** for each action within our 2008 - 2011 action plan



*... leading the way*

## BCP Priorities

### 9 Vision Themes

1. Feeling Safe
2. Ease of Access
3. Where We Live
4. Good Health:
5. Decent Homes
6. Thriving Economy
7. Our Potential
8. Living for the Future
9. Pride in Place



*... leading the way*

## BCP Strengths

- Partnership commitment
- Strategic planning
- Delivery on the ground
- Keeping in contact with our residents



*... leading the way*

## Now – and future

- Growth agenda – appropriate housing – service delivery - Rackheath Eco-community
- Demographics – the ageing population – inward migration and community cohesion
- Economics – skills and training – green technology
- Prevention – Stairway and the spiralling cost of cure



*... leading the way*

## Enhanced role of NCC and NCSP

- Visioning
- Commissioning for self reliance
- Support Partnerships as well as Partners
- Flexible responses at district level
- Prevention better than cure



*... leading the way*

## **Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership (LSP)**

Report by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development

### **Summary**

This report provides Members with the results of the questionnaire completed for Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) to enable them to scrutinise this Partnership. The Leader and Executive Director (Customer and Resources) of Great Yarmouth Borough Council will be attending the Panel meeting. Members are asked to consider whether any further scrutiny of this Partnership is needed.

### **1. Background**

- 1.1. At the meeting on 10 September 2008, Overview and Scrutiny Panel agreed that all partnerships falling within the remit of this Panel should be reviewed on a two-year rolling basis. The Breckland LSP was reviewed by Panel at the January 2009 and March 2009 meetings, and Broadland Community Partnership was reviewed at the September 2009 meeting.
- 1.2. The next partnership to be reviewed as part of the rolling programme is Great Yarmouth LSP, and this report provides members with information on the Partnership to enable them to scrutinise it.
- 1.3. For information, the NCC 'team of three' for the Great Yarmouth LSP are Mike Jackson (Chief Officer Lead), Tom Garrod (Member Lead) and Sarah Rhoden (LSP Officer).

### **2. Great Yarmouth LSP**

- 2.1. Attached is a partnership questionnaire that has been completed for the LSP. This questionnaire was discussed by the Board of the LSP at their meeting on 19 October 2009.
- 2.2. The Leader and Executive Director (Customer and Resources) of Great Yarmouth Borough Council will be attending the Panel meeting to give Panel the opportunity to explore the Partnership with them.

### **3. Equality impact assessment (EqIA)**

- 3.1. This report is not directly relevant to equality in that it is not making proposals which may have a direct impact on equality of access or outcome.

#### 4. **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

- 4.1. There are no crime and disorder implications from this report. If further scrutiny is undertaken then any implications will be considered when the scrutiny takes place.

#### **Action Required**

- (i) The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is asked to consider and comment on the partnership questionnaire (**Appendix A**) and decide whether any further scrutiny of this Partnership is needed.

#### **Background Papers**

- A long term vision and a sustainable community strategy for 2008-11 (November 2008)
- Great Yarmouth 2020 Vision

#### **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Telephone Number</b>	<b>Email address</b>
Sarah Rhoden	01603 222867	Sarah.rhoden@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 and ask for Sarah Rhoden or textphone 0344 800 8011 and we will do our best to help.



## Partnership Questionnaire

## Part 1: Summary

Date Completed: 22 October 2009

<b>1. Name of Partnership:</b>	<b>Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership</b>
Contact name:	Sarah Rhoden
Position/title:	Support Manager
Telephone:	01603 22(2867)
Email:	Sarah.rhoden@norfolk.gov.uk
<b>2. Main purpose of the Partnership:</b> <i>Please outline:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Focus and key functions</i></li> <li>• <i>An indication of scale (eg size of membership, number of volunteers, stakeholders)</i></li> <li>• <i>The geographical area it serves</i></li> <li>• <i>The size of the public it serves (eg approximate number of members of the public, inc. visitors)</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>(Alternatively, If you have an existing summary then please attach a copy)</i></p> <p>The purpose of the LSP is to help agencies to work together in order to make the best decisions about services in their area and to help them contribute to local government and community targets in health, housing, the environment, learning, crime and employment. Meeting these targets requires that agencies work together as problems can be complex, ill-health, for example, is a medical problem but it can be caused by living in a damp house or by not having the money to buy healthy food. The LSP brings people together to create a 'joined-up' approach to services and to allow the views of the wider community to be heard. It is also responsible for approving the spending of various grants, for example Neighbourhood Renewal Funding (NRF).</p> <p>The Great Yarmouth LSP brings together, at a local level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different parts of the public sector for example the police, health services and local government</li> <li>• Representatives from other partnerships, such as town centre partnerships, sport partnerships and cultural partnerships.</li> <li>• The wider community including voluntary organisations and community groups</li> <li>• The private/business sector.</li> </ul> <p>It is worth noting that when the LSP was first established it was a 'statutory' partnership in that in order for Great Yarmouth to receive certain types of government grants and funding it must have an LSP in place.</p>

<b>3. Category</b> How would you best categorise the primary purpose of the partnership?		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
	Strategic	X		Advisory and/or promotional				
	Service delivery			Co-ordinate and/or organise activity				
	Other (please state):							
<b>4. Legal status</b> Is the partnership requirement of statute, recommended by Government guidance or voluntary?		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
	Statutory			In line with Government guidance	X			
	Voluntary			Other (please state):				
<b>5. Funding</b> How is the partnership funded (on the basis of the last financial year)?	<b>Source</b>	<b>Amount</b>			<b>Amount as % of total funding</b>			
	<p>The LSP helps ensure spending of funding awarded to the Borough Council. Examples include the Working Neighbourhood Fund (£7.1m awarded over three years, starting April 2009), and prior to that the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (around £12m was awarded over 7 years) and LEGI (£8.7m covering the three years from 2006/7). The LSP also oversees the investment of the Great Yarmouth share of second homes council tax of approximately £110k per annum.</p> <p>There is also input from the County and Borough Councils, and other officers, in terms of officer time, but it is not possible to calculate the total cost of this.</p>							
<b>6. What is the total budget?</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Please specify</b>
	Less than £50,000			Between £50,000 & £249,000			£250,000 or over	X
<b>7. What is the term of any grant</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Please state below</b>	
	1 year only			Annual			Other	
	See 5 above.							
<b>8. Will this funding continue in the future?</b>	<p><b>Comments:</b> See 5 above. Funding from the Working Neighbourhood Fund etc will continue for the period of the grant. There is no guarantee that this funding will continue in future years. Input from the County and Borough councils will continue.</p>							

<b>9. NCC's resource contribution</b> (a) What is NCC's annual time commitment?	<b>Councillor representatives</b>		No of people:	1 (board member)	<b>Days:</b>	6 half days
	<b>Officer representatives:</b>		No of people:	1 (board member)	<b>Days:</b>	6 half days
	<b>Other</b>		No of people:	Approx 10 officers – but varies depending on the projects and issues being progressed. The LSP has a full-time LSP officer in post (see (b) below)	<b>Days:</b>	Varies – approx 20 day total.
(b) What is NCC's annual contribution?	<b>Financial</b>	£15,000	<b>Other (e.g. use of facilities):</b>			
	<p>When the LSP was originally set up it was a 'statutory' partnership. At that time, in order for Great Yarmouth to receive certain types of government grants and funding had to have an LSP in place. In light of this, an agreement was negotiated by the Borough Council with the County Council and the PCT to jointly fund the full-time LSP officer post at a cost to the County Council of around £15k per annum.</p> <p>This joint arrangement ensures there is shared dedicated support to the LSP so that it can better consider (and take into account) the vision and objectives of the three organisations providing the funding and can feed this effectively into taking forward key projects etc. Although this is a challenge for all LSPs, it is a particular issue for Great Yarmouth where there is a separate PCT to the rest of Norfolk (covering Great Yarmouth and Waveney).</p> <p>Sharing the funding for this post between the three organisations helps to ensure value for money. The alternatives would be for one individual organisation to provide the funding (which would place an additional burden on one organisation and would not enhance joint working) or to remove funding for this post (which would impact on the dedicated support available to the LSP in progressing issues).</p> <p>NCC does not make any other specific financial contribution to the LSP. Some NCC projects are progressed with input from/in partnership with the LSP, where feasible, but in these instances the funding remains with the County Council.</p>					

10. Development		Yes	No		Yes	No
(a) Where do you think the partnership currently is in term of its stage of development?	<b>1. Forming</b> <i>(very early stages)</i>			<b>3. Performing</b> <i>(clear roles and responsibilities and achieving its objectives)</i>	<b>X</b>	
	<b>2. Developing</b> <i>(developing working practices)</i>	<b>X</b>		<b>4. Evaluating</b> <i>(objectives achieved, reviewing impact)</i>		
(b) Does the Partnership have a development plan and, if yes, are you happy to share it with us/attach a copy?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<p><b>Comments:</b> The LSP has a Sustainable Community Strategy, which was refreshed in 2008/9, which includes outcomes measures and an action plan.</p> <p>A 'stocktake' of the LSP was carried out last year and identified a number of development actions were identified. As a result, a new outcome focused structure has been put in place with a new 'slimmed down' version of the Board and Executive supported by six delivery partnerships.</p>			
(c) Is the partnership large or complex?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<i>(If yes, please give your reasons for saying so)</i>			
	X		The LSP covers the whole of the Great Yarmouth borough (with a population of around 90,000). There is also a wide range of partners including the county and borough councils, Citizens Advice Bureau, Community Connections, the East of England Development Agency, Great Yarmouth Primary Care Trust, Learning and Skills Council, Norfolk Constabulary, Chamber of Commerce and many more.			
(d) Who was involved in setting up the Partnership? <i>(For example, internal specialists such as Head of Law, Risk Team etc, or any external specialists.)</i>	<p><b>Comments:</b> The Borough Council was the lead organization in setting up the LSP, and the first community strategy (the 2020 vision) for the borough was produced in 1997.</p> <p>In the LSP stocktake, one of the factors that determined the themes for the six delivery partnerships was the outcomes in the Norfolk Local Area Agreement.</p>					

## Part 2: Questionnaire

A. Rationale for the partnership	Comments
Is there a partnership agreement or constitution and, if so, are you happy to share it with us/attach a copy?	Agreed terms of reference are in place for the Board, Executive and the delivery partnerships – copies attached.
Is there a stated reason why the partnership exists and, if so, what is it?	Yes – set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy and the terms of reference.
Does the partnership have agreed aims, and if so, what are they? <i>Please attach a copy.</i>	Yes – set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy and the terms of reference.
Have the aims of the partnership been published and, if so, where?	Yes – the LSP has a dedicated website at <a href="http://www.gylsp.org.uk">www.gylsp.org.uk</a> .
How do the partnership aims link to the County Council's corporate objectives? <i>(Please see list at end of form)</i>	<p>The three main objectives set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy link well to the County Council's objectives and strategic ambitions – the objectives are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a prosperous and dynamic economy</li> <li>- a clean and safe environment</li> <li>- a healthy and cohesive community</li> </ul>
B. Governance arrangements	Comments
How are decisions made - is there a scheme of delegation that makes clear who can take decisions?	<p>The terms of reference (attached) set out the role of the Board, Executive and delivery partnerships.</p> <p>Key decision making is carried out within the existing processes in place within the relevant partner organizations. For example, decisions any project which the County Council is leading (i.e. funding through its existing budgets) is carried out within existing democratic processes.</p>
How are decisions recorded?	Minutes taken at Board, Executive and delivery partnership meetings.
Who makes sure they are acted upon and who scrutinises them?	The Executive oversees the work of the delivery partnerships and reports regularly to the Board.

Is there an agreement on how these decisions will be reported back and who are they reported to?	The Executive oversees the work of the delivery partnerships and reports regularly to the Board.
How are Councillors involved and how are the partnerships' activities reported into the Council's democratic structure?	A membership of the Board includes a Member of the County Council (Tom Garrod), and following Board meetings an update on discussions/key issues is sent to the Cabinet Member for Partnership and Performance and local members for the borough.
Which Cabinet portfolio is the partnership linked to?	None specifically, the Partnership covers a wide range of issues and projects.
How are conflicts of interest resolved?	By discussion.
Do members of the partnership meet at the times set out in the agreement?	Executive meetings are held monthly, Board and delivery partnership meetings are held quarterly.

<b>C. Added Value</b>	<b>Comments</b>
How does this partnership add value?	By bringing together various partners to work together on toward a shared vision, helping to maximize resources and best practice to be shared. Also, to identify where partners can collaborate to help one another achieve targets, as it is recognized that in almost all cases, no one partners can achieve its targets working in isolation.
How do you demonstrate this added value to the public?	Through publicity/press releases on related projects activities. The LSP also maintains a website at <a href="http://www.gylsp.org.uk">www.gylsp.org.uk</a> and additional public consultation exercises are carried for example to assist the re-refresh of the sustainable community strategy.

<b>D. Value for Money</b>	<b>Comments</b>
How does the partnership ensure it provides the highest quality for the cost?	<p>The majority of projects/activities taken forward are undertaken within the structure of one of the partner organizations, including the County Council (where appropriate) where there is already individual accountability for achieving value for money.</p> <p>The LSP also carries out evaluation processes before awarding funding to for specific projects and activities. For example, the LSP recently advertised for bids to fund projects to invest in measures to reduce worklessness, improve skills and increase enterprise (under the Working Neighbourhood fund). 29 bids were received which were then considered by an assessment Panel consisting of Job Centre Plus, the LSP and GYBC representatives.</p>
How is the public made aware of how the partnership achieves value for money?	Through the minutes of meetings (published on the LSP's website), and press releases and publicity relating to individual projects and activities.

<b>E. Performance management</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Has your partnership set targets and, if so, how do you know which partnership targets you are meeting and which you have yet to meet?	An action plan and outcomes measures has been agreed, as part of the Sustainable Community Strategy.
Who reviews and reports progress and how often does this take place?	One of the roles of the Board is to review the Sustainable Community Strategy, including reviewing progress against the delivery of milestones and targets and to direct the Executive where action is required. The Executive reports to the Board quarterly on progress. All six Delivery Partnerships have developed their own action plans with baselines and targets for LAA and local Sustainable Community Strategy priorities.
Are targets reviewed from time to time and, if yes, who by?	
How does the partnership agree action on targets that are not likely to be met?	

F. Financial Management	Comments
Does the partnership agreement/constitution say who will provide the money?	<p>This is not specified. The LSP does not have any specific financial responsibility. It does bring together partners and resources to enable joint working, for example advising the Borough Council on the Working Neighbourhood fund, but accountability for financial management remains within the relevant partner organization and is managed (in a financial management sense) in accordance with the procedures in place within that organisation.</p> <p>An action plan and outcomes measures has been agreed, as part of the Sustainable Community Strategy, and the LSP reviews this on a regular basis.</p>
Who can decide how to spend it?	
Can the money be reallocated and, if yes, who can authorise this?	
What are the financial reporting arrangements?	

G. Risk management	Comments
Have you carried out a risk assessment of NCC's engagement with the partnership, using the Risk Management In Partnerships Guide, and if yes, when was that?	No.
Has the partnership itself carried out a formal risk assessment of the partnership and if yes, when was that?	A 'stocktake' of the LSP was carried out last year, a number of changes have been implemented as a result.
How does the partnership know if things are going wrong?	Regular progress updates are reported to the Board.
Who can take corrective action if necessary?	The Board can commission the executive to commission initiatives and interventions.

H. Termination arrangements	Comments
Are there arrangements in place if the partnership comes to an end and, if so, what are they?	<p>No. However, the Partnership is primarily about joint working and discussion. There is no joint/pooled budget or allocation of specific resources for the LSP – work is carried out within the existing resources of the partner bodies.</p>
Are there arrangements in place if NCC decides to no longer to be involved?	
Is there a system for reallocating resources back to partners and, if so, what is it?	



I. Serving the public	Comments
Does the partnership have a communications policy and, if so, are you happy to share it with us/attach a copy?	There is no communications policy specifically for the LSP – communications are organized for specific projects/activities by the lead partner. The website is used for general communication.
How effectively does the partnership communicate with the public?	

### **NCC's nine Corporate Objectives**

- To lead a strategic approach to the development of the Norfolk economy
- To improve travel and transport
- To help make Norfolk a safe place to live and work
- To improve educational attainment and help children and young people to achieve their ambitions
- To improve the health and well-being of Norfolk's residents
- To improve opportunities for people to learn throughout life
- To protect and sustain the environment
- To build vibrant, confident and cohesive communities
- To improve and develop Norfolk's cultural heritage and resources

### **NCC's three organisational Objectives**

- Improve customer focus
- Deliver excellence and ensure good Value for Money
- Develop and support our workforce

## Great Yarmouth LSP Delivery Executive

### Terms of Reference (at June 2009)

#### Statement of Purpose

To oversee and coordinate the delivery and review of the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and Local area Agreement (LAA) in order to improve the quality of life for residents of the Borough and to promote community cohesion and equality within the Borough.

The Delivery Executive will be chaired by an officer nominated by the Borough Council

1. To performance manage the SCS Delivery Plan and the LAA and report regularly to the Board.
2. To develop and promote strong partnership working between statutory, business and community and voluntary sectors within and outside the Borough
3. To oversee and manage the work of the delivery partnerships and maximise the opportunities for joint working
4. To commission initiatives and interventions.
5. To consult, communicate with and empower residents and other stakeholders to inform LSP decision-making.
6. To foster communication between partners
7. To undertake tasks allocated by the Board

## Great Yarmouth LSP Board

### Terms of Reference (June 2009 Revision)

#### Statement of Purpose

The role of the Board is to provide leadership and direction and to hold other LSP groupings and individual agencies to account for delivery of the LSP's priorities, aims and objectives as set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and the Local Area Agreement (LAA). The Board will promote community cohesion and equality in the Borough.

The LSP Board will be chaired by the Leader of the Borough Council

1. Through partnership working to prepare and review the Sustainable Community Strategy for Great Yarmouth setting the priorities for the Borough
2. To review progress against the delivery of the milestones and targets in the SCS and in the Norfolk LAA and direct the Delivery Executive accordingly where action is required.
3. To promote strong partnership working between statutory, business and community and voluntary sectors within and outside the Borough
4. To ensure that external funding streams are co-ordinated and used strategically to help achieve the objectives in the LAA and SCS.
5. To delegate authority as appropriate to the LSP Delivery Executive in order that it can commission initiatives and interventions
6. To ensure the LSP's objectives and priorities are communicated to organisations responsible for spatial, economic and community development and regeneration in the Borough
7. To ensure the LSP is adequately resourced
8. To ensure the Partnership works effectively, economically and efficiently ensuring value for money for the Borough's residents
9. To oversee the LSP Delivery Executive and the Delivery Partnerships

**Great Yarmouth LSP Delivery Partnership (Generic)  
Terms of Reference (June 2009)**

Statement of Purpose

To deliver outputs, outcomes and milestones relevant to the (economic, environmental, strong community, health and independent living) delivery partnership as contained in Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and Local Area Agreement (LAA)

1. To report on performance quarterly to the Delivery Executive and be accountable for delivery
2. To develop SMART delivery and action plans which identify resources for those SCS and LAA targets allocated by the Board
3. To ensure and co-ordinate delivery of those action plans and keep them under review and to ensure partners build commitments into their own planning processes
4. To monitor performance against those action plans and delivery of agreed outcomes and put in place actions to address under performance
5. Have named lead partners responsible for achieving targets and monitoring performance
6. To monitor the achievement of value for money in partnership activities
7. To consult, communicate with and empower residents and other stakeholders to inform LSP decision-making.
8. To foster communication between partners
9. To undertake tasks allocated by the Delivery Executive and the Board
10. To identify gaps in service provision and seek sustainable solutions
11. To work to reduce inequalities in the Borough by prioritising areas of greatest need in terms of service provision
12. The Chair or another member of the Delivery Partnership will attend meetings of the Delivery Executive

## **Shared Services**

Report by the Director of Corporate Resources

### **Summary**

This report provides Members with a draft Terms of Reference for the new scrutiny topic looking at shared services.

Action Required:

- Members are asked to discuss and agree the recommended purpose and objectives of scrutiny as stated in the Terms of Reference.
- Members are asked to discuss and agree on the issues and questions to be addressed and the planned outcomes of the scrutiny.

### **1. Background**

1.1. At its meeting of the 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009 the Corporate Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Panel agreed to add the following scrutiny topic to its forward work programme:

- To examine the framework that this Council uses to deliver Shared Services (both internally and with other Councils) to ensure it is robust.

### **2 Scrutiny Method**

2.1 At its meeting of the 22<sup>nd</sup> October the Overview and Scrutiny Strategy Group (OSSG) agreed this area of scrutiny should go ahead and that a working group be set up to take this forward.

2.2 In addition, OSSG agreed to refer this item back to the Corporate Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Panel for the Panel to agree which areas it should look at.

### **3 Terms of Reference**

3.1 A draft Terms of Reference for this item of scrutiny is attached at Appendix A.

3.2 Suggested wording for the purpose and objectives of the scrutiny has been provided.

3.3 Further detail is required to understand the issues and questions that this Panel wishes to address and the planned outcomes of this scrutiny exercise.

#### 4. **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

4.1 The crime and disorder implications of the scrutiny topic will be considered when the scrutiny takes place.

#### 5 **Equality Impact Assessment**

5.1 There are no impacts arising from this report. Equality implications of the scrutiny topic will be considered when the scrutiny takes place.

### **Action Required**

- (i) The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is asked to discuss and agree the recommended purpose and objectives of scrutiny as stated in the terms of reference.
- (ii) The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is asked to identify and agree on the issues and questions to be addressed and the planned outcomes of the scrutiny.

### **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Telephone Number</b>	<b>Email address</b>
Paul Adams	01603 222609	<a href="mailto:Paul.adams@norfolk.gov.uk">Paul.adams@norfolk.gov.uk</a>
Jessica Reeve	01603 224424	<a href="mailto:Jessica.reeve@norfolk.gov.uk">Jessica.reeve@norfolk.gov.uk</a>



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Jessica Reeve on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

## Terms of Reference

<b>Norfolk County Council Corporate Affairs Overview and Scrutiny</b>	
<b>Terms of Reference for scrutiny of:</b>	
Shared Services	
<b>Scrutiny By:</b>	
Working Group	
<b>Membership of Working Group:</b>	
<b>Members:</b>  William Nunn Roger Smith Alec Byrne John Dobson Mike Brindle	<b>Officers:</b>  TBC
<b>Purpose and Objectives of Scrutiny:</b>	
<p>To examine the framework that this Council uses to deliver Shared Services (both internally and with public, private and third sector bodies).</p> <p>To consider opportunities for more efficient and cost effective service delivery through the identification of opportunities for shared services both within Norfolk County Council and with public, private and third sector bodies.</p>	
<b>Issues and Questions to be Addressed:</b>	
<b>Planned Outcomes:</b>	
<b>Deadlines and Timetable:</b>	
<b>Terms of Reference agreed by:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

## Forward Work Programme: Scrutiny

Report by the Director of Corporate Resources

### Summary

This report asks Members to review and develop the programme for scrutiny.

## 1. The Programme

1.1. The Outline Programme for Scrutiny (Appendix A) has been updated to show progress since the 23 September 2009 Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

1.2 Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel can add new topics to the scrutiny programme in line with the criteria below: -

(i) High **profile** – as identified by:

- Members (through constituents, surgeries, etc)
- Public (through surveys, Citizen's Panel, etc)
- Media
- External inspection (Audit Commission, Ombudsman, Internal Audit, Inspection Bodies)

(ii) Impact – this might be significant because of:

- The scale of the issue
- The budget that it has
- The impact that it has on members of the public (this could be either a small issue that affects a large number of people or a big issue that affects a small number of people)

(iii) Quality – for instance, is it:

- Significantly under performing
- An example of good practice
- Overspending

(iv) It is a Corporate Priority

1.3 Appendix B attached enables all Overview & Scrutiny Panel members to put forward considered proposals at the meeting with supporting information for a future scrutiny review. This then assists the Scrutiny Planning Group in applying the scoring system and seeking further information where necessary. The Group can then report back to the Panel recommending approval to add items to the scrutiny forward programme on the basis of their relative priorities.



## 2. Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act

2.1. The crime and disorder implications of the various scrutiny topics will be considered when the scrutiny takes place

## 3 Equality Impact Assessment

3.1 This report is not directly relevant to equality, in that it is not making proposals that will have a direct impact on equality of access or outcomes for diverse groups.

### Action Required

- (1) The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is asked to consider the attached Outline Programme (Appendix A) and agree the scrutiny topics listed and reporting dates.
- (2) The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is invited to consider new topics for inclusion on the scrutiny programme in line with the criteria at paragraph 1.2.

### Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Name	Telephone Number	Email address
Jessica Reeve	01603 224424	<a href="mailto:Jessica.reeve@norfolk.gov.uk">Jessica.reeve@norfolk.gov.uk</a>



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Jessica Reeve on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

## Outline Programme for Scrutiny

Standing Item for Corporate Affairs O & S Panel: Update for 18 November 2009

### **This is only an outline programme and will be amended as issues arise or priorities change**

Scrutiny is normally a two-stage process:

- Stage 1 of the process is the scoping stage. Draft terms of reference and intended outcomes will be developed as part of this stage.
- The Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Panel or a Member Group will carry out the detailed scrutiny but other approaches can be considered, as appropriate (e.g. 'select committee' style by whole O&S Panel).
- On the basis that the detailed scrutiny is carried out by a Member Group, Stage 2 is reporting back to the O&S Panel by the Group.

This Panel welcomes the strategic ambitions for Norfolk. These are:

- A vibrant, strong and sustainable economy
- Aspirational people with high levels of achievement and skills
- An inspirational place with a clear sense of identity

These ambitions inform the NCC Objectives from which scrutiny topics for this Panel will develop, as well as using the outlined criteria at paragraph 1.2 above.

#### Changes to Programme from that previously submitted to the Panel on 18<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Added – Shared Services

Deleted – None

Topic	Outline Objective	Cabinet Portfolio Area	Stage 1 (scoping report)	Stage 2 (report back to Panel by Working Group)	Requested by	Comment
<b>Scrutiny Items Outstanding/ Ongoing</b>						
1. Partnership Reviews	To review all partnerships within the Corporate Affairs remit using the Partnership Questionnaire Tool	Corporate Services	N/A	1 <sup>st</sup> Partnership Report Jan 09	CAOS Sept 08	All partnership reviews added into forward programme. Panel will look at one per meeting for the coming year.
2. Review of Councils Constitution	A wide ranging review of the Councils Constitution to make it effective and fit for purpose.	Corporate Services		TBC	CAOS Nov 08	Meetings scheduled for 2009/10.
3. Sickness Absence	To consider a detailed analysis of sickness absences to establish whether any action could be taken to reduce the average numbers of days lost and improve the councils performance	Corporate Services		TBC	Cabinet Jun 09	Meetings scheduled for 2009.
4. Shared Services		Corporate Services	Nov 2009	TBC	CAOS Sept 09	Terms of Reference reported for agreement at Nov 09 CAOS meeting.

5. Effective use of County Buildings	Review existing policies and processes in relation to properties occupied by the County Council to ensure that the corporate property portfolio is being managed in the most effective way	Corporate Services		Jan 2009	CAOS Jan 08	Following the report to CAOS in Jan 09 it was agreed that the template developed to look at the Councils estate in Kings Lynn could be used across the County. Overview & Scrutiny Strategy Group agreed in Oct 09 to suspend any further work on this group until the outcome of the organisational review is known.
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------	--	----------	-------------	---

**Completed Scrutiny Items:**

Pay and Grading - Equality Impact Assessment – Nov 2007  
2<sup>nd</sup> Homes Council Tax Money – Nov 2007  
Work Experience (Working Group) – Dec 2007  
Risk Management Presentation – Mar 2008  
Invest to Improve/Save Reserve – Jul 2008  
Partnership Working (North Norfolk LSP) – Sept 2008  
Strategic Ambitions Reserve – Jan 2009  
Lone Working – Jan 2009  
Breckland LSP – Mar 2009  
Broadland Community Partnership – Sept 09

Assessment scheme for prioritizing scrutiny topics

**Rules:**

1. No item should be added to the Forward Work Programme before being scored/ assessed.
2. The member proposing the item should score/assess the topic before submitting it to their Group Spokesperson on the relevant committee, providing as much supporting information as possible.
3. If the committee agrees that the topic should be pursued, the scrutiny planning meeting should consider the scoring/assessment and decide what priority the topic should take.
4. The Overview and Scrutiny Strategy Group should ensure that the right committee is doing the work and make connections with scrutiny activity previously done or already underway.

**Total Score needed: 50 or over for priority  
45 or over for consideration  
35 or over for future consideration  
Under 35 - reject**

**Proposed Topic:**

**Proposed by:**

Objective/Outcomes:

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Supporting information/evidence</b>
		*Use separate sheet if necessary
<b>a) Score 0-10</b>		
Corporate Priorities/Objectives – Will the review contribute to the Council's objectives and priorities?		
Weak/Poor Performance – Are there issues of weak or poor performance?		
Public importance – Is the issue ranked as important by the people of Norfolk?		
Public dissatisfaction – Is there evidence of general dissatisfaction?		
Will scrutiny be of benefit to citizens (service delivery and improvement)?		
Member concern – Has the matter been widely identified by Members as a 'local Member' issue?		
<b>b) Score 0-5</b>		
Will the outcomes be measurable and of value (i.e., will the scrutiny 'make a difference'?)		
<b>c) Score 0-2</b>		
Legislation – Is there new Government guidance or legislation?		
Other Inspections – Have inspections been completed/are they expected?		
Audit – Has the issue been raised by the internal or external auditor?		
Will scrutiny be of benefit to the Council (Corporate governance)?		
Are there issues of financial control?		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		

**(Scoring: 0 shows you strongly disagree with the question raised under 'criteria' and 10 that you strongly agree)**

## COMPLIMENTS AND COMPLAINTS DURING 2008/09

Report by the Head of Democratic Services

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the number and spread of Corporate Compliments and Complaints dealt with by the Council in the period 2008/09. It also sets out information requested at the last meeting of the Panel and the information on Freedom of Information enquiries and complaints, specifically officer time spent providing information and other related costs and including the number of people who habitually make FOI requests and the costs incurred.

The report sets out progress against key actions arising from the audit of complaints in 2008. Progress on implementing the action plan for complaints (compliments are not included) has already been made on the most urgent points. The Complaints Policy and Procedures were amended to reflect the audit findings; information has been passed to all departmental complaints officers to ensure consistency of approach across the council; reporting timescales have been tightened up to minimise delays in reporting.

There has been a significant increase in the number of stage 1 complaints received in Adult Social Services and Planning and Transportation, however these have not resulted in a significant increase in stage 2 and 3 complaints which have remained almost stable. This means that we have been very successful in resolving complaints at the first instance.

The report concludes that the review of complaint management which has been underway in all services and departments has introduced a quality control element to ensure that decisions taken are evidenced and robust. Action has also been taken to improve turnaround times in departments for all complaints, which especially include those for the Ombudsman. Administering the Council's complaints system and the Council's statutory responsibilities under the Freedom of Information Act does incur significant costs to the Council. However, the complaints system is a key element of improving customer focus by listening to our customers and responding to their feedback, while use of the FOI Act is becoming an established and valued democratic right that affords people a greater understanding of the work we do and how and why we make our decisions.

The report recommends that the Panel considers the figures relating to general complaints for the year to 31st March 2009 and the information on Freedom of Information enquiries and complaints, specifically officer time spent providing information and other related costs and including the number of people who habitually make FOI requests and the costs incurred. The report concludes that collecting further information on the costs of dealing with complaints and the number of habitual complaints will help members to make informed judgements on the balance between the service offered on complaints and the cost to the Council Tax payer and makes recommendations to that effect.

## 1.0 BACKGROUND TO CORPORATE POLICY AND PROCEDURES

- 1.1 Improving customer focus is a key organisational objective for the Council. Listening to our customers and responding to their feedback is an important part of improving customer focus.
- 1.2 The Corporate Compliments and Complaints policy and procedures are in place to address individual matters of concern raised by the public but also operate as an effective performance-monitoring tool for the Council. Detailed compliment and complaint information is reported to Cabinet annually.
- 1.3 As a background to the report the Council's procedure for handling compliments and complaints is summarised below.
- 1.4 When a complaint is received, the procedures identify three possible stages of a complaint. **Stage 1** is the initial stage with the definition of a complaint as "when customers do not feel they have received a satisfactory response to an expression of dissatisfaction about an action or lack of action by the Council and when they wish to progress this to a formal complaint."
- 1.5 If the matter is not resolved to the complainant's satisfaction then the customer may take their complaint to **Stage 2**, to departmental level, where it is investigated by the Departmental Compliments and Complaints Officer. If the matter continues to be unresolved and the customer wishes to take the complaint further, then it moves to **Stage 3**, which is at Chief Executive level.
- 1.6 Complaints at the Chief Executive Level (**Stage 3**) are administered by the Head of Democratic Services. The investigation is carried out by a senior officer, often the designated Compliments and Complaints officer, within another department, although the Chief Executive is responsible for all responses at this level.
- 1.7 When a Compliment is received it is logged with the Departmental Compliments and Complaints Officer and they will ensure the manager passes on the positive feedback to the team or individual concerned. We need to ensure that positive feedback and praise is acknowledged and staff who are doing a good job are given every encouragement, by means of management or Chief Officer letter.
- 1.8 The Council's Compliments and Complaints procedure does not impact upon those areas (e.g. in Adult Social Services and Children's Services) where a statutory system already exists and takes precedence. The Adult Social Services Compliments and Complaints Officer reports directly to the Adult Social Services Overview & Scrutiny Panel each year on compliments and complaints that have been processed through the statutory system. Complaints against schools are dealt with by the head teacher or governing body.
- 1.9 At your last meeting, you asked that as part of this report details were provided on Freedom of Information enquiries and complaints, specifically officer time spent providing information and other related costs and including the number of people who habitually make FOI requests and the costs incurred.



## **2.0 ACTION SINCE LAST REPORT**

- 2.1 An internal audit of the complaints and compliments scheme was carried out in 2008 and was followed up with a review of the policy and procedures and an action plan.
- 2.2 Progress on implementing the action plan for complaints (compliments are not included) has already been made on the most urgent points. The Complaints Policy and Procedures were amended to reflect the audit findings; information has been passed to all departmental complaints officers to ensure consistency of approach across the council; reporting timescales have been tightened up to minimise delays in reporting.
- 2.3 Chief Officers receive a monthly report on the status of Ombudsman, Stage 3 and Stage 2 complaints. Departments are required to report the Stage 2 information and confirm, when complaints have been upheld, that an action plan has been implemented to improve systems.
- 2.4 Feedback forms for the Stage 1 complaints that do not progress have been in use in all departments for several months. As well as finding out if the complainant was satisfied, these forms now pick up useful ethnicity and disability data to help us learn how accessible our process is to these groups. The forms are not returned in great numbers but it is hoped that whatever data that can be gathered will help inform performance improvements.
- 2.5 The audit of complaints flagged up the need for a more consistent approach to complaint responses across departments and services. Quality control is now in place to ensure that complaints are responded to in a polite, thorough and timely fashion.
- 2.6 There are a number of other initiatives arising from the action plan which will be implemented over the year ahead, including the publication of success stories, where the Council has changed something following a complaint, the introduction of new training for staff, the development of some web based advice for staff handling complaints including advice on speaking to complainants and templates for response letters.

## **3.0 CORPORATE COMPLIMENTS AND COMPLAINTS REPORTED DURING THE YEAR 2008/009**

- 3.1 The table below summarises the compliments and complaints received by individual departments during the year.
- 3.2 It is the aim of all those involved in dealing with complaints that resolution is made as close to the source as possible; consequently many complaints proceed no further than a first informal enquiry or Stage 1.

**Table 1** Corporate Complaints – Stage 1's, 2's, 3's for the period 01-04-08 to 31-03-09 (01.04.07 – 31.03.08 figures shown also)

<u>Department</u>	<u>Stage 1</u>		<u>Stage 2</u>		<u>Stage 3</u>	
	<b>08/09</b>	<b>07/08</b>	<b>08/09</b>	<b>07/08</b>	<b>08/09</b>	<b>07/08</b>
Dept Finance	0	1	0	0	0	0
Cultural Services						
- Arts	1	1	0	0	0	0
- Libraries	1	1	0	0	0	0
- Museums	1	0	2	0	1	0
- Adult Education	55	88	1	1	0	0
- Records Office	3	2	0	0	0	0
Planning & Transportation	207	75	5	5	2	1
Children's Services (incl. corporate, statutory and carers complaints)	93	76	11	12	5	3
Adult Social Services	534	332	4	5	0	1
Trading Standards	10	24	1	3	0	3
Chief Executive's	20	3	3	1	2	0
Fire Service	10	10	2	4	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>935</b>	<b>613</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

- 3.3 All first level complaints to Adult Social Services and Children's Services are put through the statutory process in the first instance. A number of these complaints lead to either statutory or corporate complaints investigations at a higher level. This report details only the corporate complaints figures for Stages 2 and 3.
- 3.4 Forms are submitted from departments and services giving the breakdown of this information along with further detail about the type of complaint, the geographical spread and detailing, where applicable, what further action or policy changes resulted from this feedback. The forms are for the year 1 April 2008 to 31 March 2009 and can be made available for members if required.
- 3.5 Cultural Services compliments and complaints have been broken down by service following a recommendation from Corporate Affairs Review Panel in March 2007.

**Table 2** Compliments received for the period April 2008 to March 2009.

<b>Department</b>	<b>No. of Compliments</b>
Finance	<b>No data</b>
<u>Cultural Services</u>	
-Libraries	<b>51</b>
-Arts	<b>160</b>
-Museums /Archaeological	<b>106</b>
-Norfolk Record Office	<b>314</b>
-Adult Education	<b>82</b>
Planning and Transportation	<b>649</b>
Children's Services	<b>21</b>
Adult Social Services	<b>183</b>
Trading Standards	<b>10</b>
Chief Executive's	<b>48</b>
Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service	<b>3</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1627</b>

3.6 A compliment has to be evidenced by an email or a letter or by a note from a recorded telephone conversation. It is likely that many more compliments are received informally by departmental staff than are recorded in table 2 above.

#### **4.0 INFORMATION REQUESTED BY THE PANEL ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ENQUIRIES**

4.1 The Freedom of Information Act came into force at the beginning of 2005. It deals with access to official information, while parallel regulations deal with environmental information. The Act provides individuals or organisations with the right to request information held by a public authority. They can do this by letter or email. The public authority must tell the applicant whether it holds the information, and must normally supply it within 20 working days, in the format requested. However, the public authority does not have to confirm or deny the existence of the information or provide it if an exemption applies, the request is vexatious or similar to a previous request, or if the cost of compliance exceeds an appropriate limit. If exemption applies, but is qualified, this means that the public authority must decide whether the public interest in using the exemption outweighs the public interest in releasing the information.

4.2 If an applicant is unhappy with a refusal to disclose information, they can complain to the Information Commissioners Office (ICO), after first exhausting any internal review procedure. The ICO will investigate the case and either uphold the authority's use of an exemption or decide that the information must be disclosed. The Act is fully retrospective and applies to all information, not just information filed since the Act came into force.

4.3 The Corporate Freedom of Information and Data Protection Unit is the lead for FOI within the council. They coordinate cross-departmental requests and respond to others, offer central tracking and performance monitoring of requests, provide guidance, training and advice, and are responsible for the FOI Publication Scheme. The unit is also the corporate lead for compliance with the Data Protection Act and records management and it contains four members of staff. Its overall budget for 2009/10 is £143,000.

- 4.4 The Corporate FOI unit is complemented by departmental FOI officers. Their specialist, local knowledge is essential in dealing with requests efficiently within the statutory deadline. The departments that receive the majority of the requests (Adult Social Services, Children's Services, Planning and Transportation) have at least one officer who deals with FOI requests as a main part of their job (alongside other duties, i.e. data protection, records management, complaints etc). Other areas have trained officers who will deal with requests relating to their department, or to collate and then provide the information to the corporate unit, on top of their normal duties. We do not have any employees who solely deal with FOI. Many other members of staff will also have some involvement with dealing with an FOI request over the course of a year.
- 4.5 Full details of the cost of this work are not recorded, although estimates of the time spent on each request are logged in the central database. Legal Services are an exception where time is recorded for charging purposes and the cost to the Council for Legal advice on FOI in 2008/9 was £19324.
- 4.6 Officers in the Freedom of Information Team have been asked to provide for 2008/9 data for the following areas:
- numbers of requests,
  - applicant category,
  - some examples of the main areas covered in each category
  - if any particular individuals/organisations within each category were responsible for a high proportion

We received 529 Freedom of Information (FOI) requests in 2008/09, compared to 364 in 2007/08 and 374 in 2006/07.

#### 4.7 FOI Costs/Time data

- 4.7.1 The work that is needed to process a request, and the resulting cost to the authority, varies considerably depending on the complexity of each case. We can only refuse a request due to the amount of work involved if the time taken would exceed 18 hours and this figure excludes the time spent considering exemptions and consulting with third parties. The FOI Act uses a flat rate of £25 per hour for the purposes of calculating whether a request falls within the 'appropriate limit' and can therefore be taken forward. Using this as a guide, the average cost of an FOI request in each of the last three years has been:

08/09: £90

07/08: £89.50

06/07: £82

- 4.7.2 The costs involved in dealing with a request increase dramatically if a decision to withhold information is appealed. It is estimated that processing a complaint can cost upwards of £1,200, based on the £25 per hour rate. Our policy of 'getting it right first time' has meant that in the last three financial years combined only 17 requests (1.3 per cent) have resulted in an internal appeal/complaint. Two of these complaints were subsequently referred on to the Information Commissioner's Office.

#### 4.8 2008/09 Applicant data

4.8.1 Applicants are not required to provide proof of identity or a reason for their request; therefore we cannot always be certain of the category they should fall under. Subject to this caveat, the following table provides a breakdown of the number of requests submitted by each applicant category in 2008/09. Further details about the four main applicant groups are provided thereafter.

<b>Applicant category</b>	<b>Number of FOI requests received</b>
Individual	198
Political/Pressure group or Trade Union	111
Media	110
Business	62
Solicitor	16
University/Research	12
Public sector	11
Charity	9

4.9 Individuals 198 requests (37 per cent of the total received).

4.9.1 In most cases the requests related to a specific point of interest that was satisfied in one or two requests, with the most requests received from a single person being six. The main areas of interest included staff/councillor training, travel and expenses, expenditure on specific items/services, schools (school meals, selling school land, attendance data, exclusions data), the provision of social care and details about specific planning proposals/consultations.

4.10 Political/Pressure groups/Trade unions 111 (21 per cent of the total received).

These included:

Conservatives: 55 requests

Liberal Democrats: 19

Labour: 3

Tax Payers' Alliance: 6

4.10.1 Requests from political parties are generally submitted by MPs (or on their behalf), research departments or campaign headquarters. These requests are often for statistical data and can relate to national initiatives, such as Building Schools for the Future, or topical subjects such as the use of powers under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act. Requests from trade unions or pressure groups will typically relate to personnel matters such as remuneration of staff and pensions or specific incidents/ongoing projects.

4.11 Media in 2008/09 110 (21 per cent of the total received).

The applicants included:

Local press: 22

DataNews\*: 11

Mail on Sunday: 10

Times Educational Supplement: 7

Sunday Telegraph: 6

BBC: 6

Independent on Sunday: 4

Sunday Times: 4

News of the World: 3

\* a company that "utilises information and statistics, often obtained using Freedom of Information legislation, to provide news stories for a variety of media outlets".

4.11.1 Requests will often be inspired by current topics of debate with national newspapers typically sending the same request to all relevant councils in the country. In 08/09, these included the national database ContactPoint, investments in Icelandic Banks and use of powers under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act. Other popular topics included expenditure (for example on foreign travel), child protection, and schools (admissions, exclusions, personal injury claims and stress-related illness).

4.12 Business 62 (12 per cent of the total received).

4.12.1 These are mostly one-off requests about topics relevant to the company that is making the request (such as ICT contracts/equipment, commissioning of care etc). In some cases they represent formal enquiries that may have been submitted to public authorities as questionnaires (with limited success in terms of receiving any sort of response) prior to the FOI Act.

## **5.0 INFORMATION REQUESTED BY THE PANEL ON COMPLAINTS**

5.1 There is a degree of central co-ordination of the Complaints procedure but again the vast majority of work in dealing with them is done by departments. It is only stage 3 and Ombudsman complaints that are dealt with at a corporate level.

5.2 Departments have been asked to provide an estimate of costs associated with dealing with complaints and this will be provided in future reports. This is mainly the costs of officers who are "dedicated" complaints officers and does not take into account that of officers who are involved in helping to draft responses or those investigating stage 3 complaints or co-coordinating the Complaints system – again these officers do not time record in a way that would give helpful information to the Committee, but again it would be reasonable to conclude that the true costs to the authority are well in excess of any costs identified by departments.

5.3 One other area where complaints are made is to the Standards Committee. In the last year there were 0 complaints. This year so far there have been 3 complaints and the Legal Services' costs of processing these have been £9766. Again, a number of other officer and member costs are incurred through this process but are not collected systematically.

- 5.4 Putting costs against individual complaints is difficult because most staff at the Council do not time record. However, where time recording does take place, it is possible to be more precise as to the cost to the Council tax payer. Clearly the Council has to balance the benefits of using complaints as a way of improving our service against the efficient and effective use of public money.
- 5.5 Departments have been asked to provide details of any direct costs of administering the complaints system in their areas as a whole and per complaint. It has not been possible to draw this information retrospectively since no records currently exist, but this will be gathered in future by requiring services and departments to report their estimated costs in total (and per complaint if excessive) alongside the numbers of complaints on a six monthly basis to this panel.
- 5.6 Departments have also been asked to identify the number of people who make vexatious complaints or who habitually complain. There are none to report this period, but this information will be gathered as part of the six monthly monitoring for this panel in the future.
- 5.7 Whilst no formal collation of habitual complaints has taken place by Departments up to this point, officers are aware from discussions that there are a very small number of complainants that make regular complaints about a variety of issues. Once steps have been put in place with departments to collect costs and other information (including agreeing criteria to be used in identifying a category of habitual complaints) then further information will be able to be brought forward to the Panel. Members will then be better placed to make judgements on the balance between the service offered on complaints and the cost to the Council Tax payer so it can be carefully costed and monitored.

## **6.0 CONCLUSIONS**

- 6.1 A review of complaint management as described above has been underway in all services and departments and a quality control element has been introduced to ensure that decisions taken are evidenced and robust. Action has also been taken to improve turnaround times in departments for all complaints. Administering the Council's complaints system and the Council's statutory responsibilities under the Freedom of Information Act does incur significant costs to the Council. However, the complaints system is a key element of improving customer focus by listening to our customers and responding to their feedback. Collecting further information on the costs of dealing with complaints and the number of habitual complaints will help members to make informed judgements on the balance between the service offered on complaints and the cost to the Council Tax payer.

## **6.0 SECTION 17 CRIME & DISORDER ACT 1998**

- 6.1 The direct implications have been considered and the impact on crime and disorder is not judged to be significant in this instance.

## **7.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 7.1 The report does not suggest any alternative options.

## **8.0 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

8.1 There is no additional impact on equality.

## **9.0 RISK IMPLICATIONS / ASSESSMENT**

9.1 The Council needs to continue to monitor complaints to ensure that our speed of response to complaints continues to improve.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

10.1 It is recommended that the Panel:

- Considers the figures relating to general complaints for the year to 31st March 2009 and data on Freedom of Information and complaints;
- Endorses the actions proposed in paragraphs 5.5 to 5.7 of the report.

### **Contact**

Caroline Clarke, Democratic Services 01603 222949 [caroline.clarke@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:caroline.clarke@norfolk.gov.uk)



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Caroline Clarke on telephone number 01603 222949 and we will do our best to help



**Performance and Resources  
Monitoring Report**

**Report by the Director of Corporate Resources**

**Executive Summary**

This report provides an update on performance and financial monitoring information relevant to this Panel.

Up to date performance information is reported for those corporate health indicators where 2nd Quarter data is available. An update is provided on progress towards the Council's three Organisational Objectives: Improve Customer Focus; Deliver Value for Money and Develop and Support our Workforce.

11 out of the 13 performance indicators reported on are on target at this point in the year. One indicator is within 5% of target – Forecast budget spend against adjusted Capital budget. One indicator is off target by more than 5% - Percentage of employees with a disability.

The revenue budget 2009/10 update, reserves and provisions, and the capital programme 2009/10 update are also reported.

**Recommendation:**

The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is asked to comment on the report and consider any actions that may be needed.

**1. Introduction**

1.1 Integrated monitoring reports are made to each Overview and Scrutiny Panel meeting. The monitoring reports to this Panel focus on how we are performing against the Council's three Organisational Objectives:

- Improve Customer Focus
- Deliver Value for Money
- Develop and Support our Workforce

1.2 This report provides performance data available for the 2nd Quarter and an update is provided on progress towards the Council's three Organisational Objectives. The performance data for the 2nd Quarter is set out in Appendix A.

## 2. Performance update

### 2.1 Objective A - Improve customer focus

2.1.1 NCC's Customer Service Strategy sets out our approach to improving customer focus and a key element is developing and embedding a culture of good practice in customer service. Much has already been achieved with the results of our 2009 Employee Survey showing that 87% of staff say that customers are at the heart of everything they do. However, the survey also shows that just 57% of staff say that NCC is customer focussed and so there is room for improvement.

2.1.2 One contribution towards this culture change is through our celebrating National Customer Service Week, which is an opportunity to raise the profile of customer focus. This year Customer Service Week was held during 5- 11 October and key outcomes included:

- Further progress towards developing a positive culture around feedback, with an all-staff mystery-shopping exercise on the council's services running throughout October. Learning from this will be fed back to service areas
- Good staff involvement with approximately 1000 people taking part in sharing good practice, giving feedback, learning about good customer service and celebrating achievement.

### 2.2 Objective B - Deliver value for money

2.2.1 The new Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) framework came into force on 1 April 2009. One of the key components is the Organisational Assessment, which includes a new Use of Resources (UoR) assessment. The UoR assessment is structured into three themes:

- Managing Finances
- Governing the Business
- Managing Resources

2.2.2 These three themes are drawn together to produce an overall scored judgement on the value for money in the use of resources. The Audit Commission uses a four point scale where 1 is lowest and 4 is highest. The County Council has recently received a score of 3 under the new framework - this means "exceeding minimum requirements" and "performing well". Our scores for each UoR theme are as follows:

Use of resources theme	Scored judgement
Managing Finances	3
Governing the Business	3
Managing Resources	3

2.2.3 This UoR assessment forms a key part of our overall Organisational Assessment, which the Audit Commission will publish on 10 December 2009.

## 2.3 Objective C - Develop and support our workforce

- 2.3.1 At 2.06%, the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter figure for the total number of employees declaring a disability continues to decline (from 2.09% at quarter 1) and we remain bottom quartile.
- 2.3.2 One of the challenges is under-reporting of disability as employees may not consider that their disability is relevant to their job and do not wish to declare it. We are taking action to help improve this is by publicising the routes by which staff can declare their status.
- 2.3.3 We are also looking at ways to improve our understanding of the issues and inequalities experienced by disabled staff working at NCC. As part of the current work to refresh the County Council's Disability Equality Scheme (DES), which covers County Council employees, we will be reviewing what we are doing as an employer to promote equality for disabled staff. In early December we are holding a staff focus group which will consider the results of the recent employee survey, in relation to responses by disabled employees, and identify the key improvements to be made by the County Council as an employer over the next three years. A next step will be to set up a permanent disabled staff action group to help ensure continuous improvement for disabled employees in the future.

## 3 Revenue Budget 2009/10 update

- 3.1 The overall Revenue Budget for this panel for 2009/10 is a net expenditure budget of £14.206M. The overall budget comprises of spending on a number of service departments amounting to £31.242M. This is offset by the Finance General net income budget of (£17.036M). Details are set out in the table below which shows the current adjusted budget, as at the end of September 2009, and the projected outturn for the year for each department.

### 3.2 Revenue Budget Outturn 2009-2010

	Adjusted Budget £M	Outturn £M	Variation From Adjusted Budget (Under)/Over £M
Chief Executive's	28.800	28.800	0.000
Property Services	2.442	2.442	0.000
Total excluding Fin.Gen.	31.242	31.242	0.000
Finance General (net income)	(17.036)	(18.844)	(1.808)
Total	<u>14.206</u>	<u>12.398</u>	<u>(1.808)</u>

### 3.3 **Chief Executives** – £0.000M

3.3.1 The Chief Executive's total budget includes £5.771M net expenditure budget for Corporate Finance and £1.694M net expenditure budget that relates to Coroners, Elections and Registrars.

3.3.2 A breakeven position is currently forecast for the component elements of the Chief Executive's budget.

### 3.4 **Property Services** – £0.000M

3.4.1 A breakeven position is currently forecast for Property Services.

### 3.5 **Finance General**– (£1.808M)

3.5.1 The Finance General budget shows a net overall underspending of (£1.808M). This comprises of the following main variations:

3.5.2 Interest rates are monitored continually to determine advantageous borrowing and investment opportunities. Additional income of £0.800M is forecast to be received principally due to the repayment of debt and the difference between interest paid on external borrowings and interest earned on cash balances. It is early in the financial year and there is currently the potential for interest rate changes and the opportunity to take advantage of further debt restructuring. Any further variations will be reported to future Panel meetings.

3.5.3 Slippage in the 2008/09 capital programme has resulted in a revenue saving of (£0.371M) due to a revised debt repayment calculation after the 2009/10 budget was approved.

3.5.4 The recovery of VAT from previous years including accrued interest has resulted in additional income of £0.273M.

3.5.5 Additional funding of £0.364M for 2009/10 has been received in respect of the Local Authority Business Growth Incentive Scheme (LABGI).

### 3.6 **Icelandic Banks**

3.6.1 At Cabinet on the 13<sup>th</sup> October 2008, Members were informed of the Council's exposure to Icelandic banks. £32.5M of the Council's investments (then around £300M) had been invested with 3 Icelandic banks; Landsbanki (£15M), Kaupthing (£10M) and Glitnir (£7.5M). The banks were taken into administration in early October by the Icelandic Government and their assets frozen.

3.6.2 The Local Government Association (LGA) continues to coordinate recovery action on behalf of local authorities, with legal support being provided by Bevan Brittan.

- 3.6.3 During August, the LGA raised invoices for costs incurred between February and May 2009. The costs relate to legal work undertaken by Bevan Brittan across a range of issues and for financial advice provided by Ernst & Young in relation to the financial instruments being negotiated to compensate creditors. As previously agreed, costs have been apportioned between local authorities based on the value of their Icelandic Bank deposits. Norfolk's share of total costs to date is £14,077.
- 3.6.4 The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) has issued revised guidance on how local authorities should account for Icelandic deposits in their 2008/09 Statement of Accounts. The guidance is based on the latest available information in respect of each bank and reflects, for example: the improved cash flow in respect of Kaupthing (20% rather than 10% received in July in relation to the first repayment), the reduction by Landsbanki of its estimated repayments (from 95% to 83%) and the extension of the claim period for interest (from November 2008 to April 2009) in respect of Glitnir and Landsbanki. The guidance states that the 2008/09 Accounts "only need to be changed where the revised estimates are materially different". Having re-calculated the level of impairment for each bank, District Audit has confirmed that the County Council will not need to amend its 2008/09 Statement of Accounts in respect of the revised guidance.
- 3.6.5 The Administrators of Kaupthing produced their latest 6-monthly progress report at the end of October. The Administrators reported their intention to make a second distribution of a minimum of 7p in the £ in December 2009 and a third distribution (quantum to be determined) in March/April 2010. The Administrators have also revised their estimated total distributions to between 60p to 75p in the £. This compares to the previous estimate of 50p in the £.
- 3.6.6 The terms of the financial agreement that will compensate creditors of the old Glitnir bank is expected to be agreed shortly. Current information continues to suggest that there are sufficient assets to repay local authority depositors in full assuming "preferential creditor status" is confirmed and upheld in the event of any legal challenge. The court proceedings which will determine the preferential status of creditors is expected to take place in January.
- 3.6.7 Negotiations on the terms of the Landsbanki financial instrument, which will compensate creditors, are continuing. Bevan Brittan is working closely with HM Treasury's legal and financial advisors in relation to these negotiations to ensure that creditor compensation is independently assessed. This work includes pressing the Landsbanki Resolution Committee for details of how it intends to maximise value from the old bank's assets.
- 3.6.8 The latest projected recovery from all 3 banks is calculated to be £29.343M. However, it should be noted that both Landsbanki and Glitnir recoveries are subject to confirmation that local authority deposits enjoy preferential creditor status, which is likely to have to be tested through Icelandic courts. The calculated level of recovery is subject to variation in the light of the final outcome of the administration process of each bank.
- 3.6.9 The LGA is planning an update meeting for all councils with deposits in Icelandic banks on Friday 6<sup>th</sup> November 2009 in London. The County Council will be attending.

## 4. Reserves and Provisions

- 4.1 For Reserves and Provisions (as reported monthly to Cabinet in Annex A), a final statement is set out below, followed by an explanation of movements on the reserves and provisions.

<u>Reserve / Provision</u>	Balance 31.03.09 £M	Projected Balance 31.03.10 £M	Movement £M
Building Maintenance	0.550	0.000	(0.550)
Insurance Provision	6.173	6.173	0.000
Insurance Reserve	0.000	0.000	0.000
IT Earmarked Reserve	5.059	1.616	(3.443)
Repairs and Renewals Fund	0.252	0.267	0.015
Usable Capital Receipts	1.222	1.812	0.590
Industrial Estate	0.044	0.038	(0.006)
Capital Funding Reserve	3.846	2.500	(1.346)
Affordable Housing & County Strategic Partnership	1.283	1.509	0.226
Potential Pension Liability Provision	1.270	1.270	0.000
Redundancy & Pension Reserve	0.984	0.984	0.000
Modern Reward Strategy Reserve	6.210	6.210	0.000
Strategic Ambitions Reserve	2.902	1.207	(1.695)
Modern Reward Strategy Provision (for 2007/08 & 2008/09)	17.219	17.219	0.000
Organisational Change Reserve	3.442	2.537	(0.905)
Total	<u>50.456</u>	<u>43.342</u>	<u>(7.114)</u>

### 4.2 Building Maintenance Fund

During 2008/09, £0.300M of the County Hall rates refund and £0.280M of LABGI funding was transferred into the Fund for additional building maintenance works; the balance of this funding will be spent in 2009/10.

### 4.3 Information Technology Reserve

£4.444M of the balance is held in respect of e-services and relates to the delivery of the ICT Medium Term Plan, the Efficiency Programme and Customer Services initiatives in 2009/10 and beyond. The projected movement relates to this planned expenditure.

### 4.4 Usable Capital Receipts

The level of money held is dependent on the level of receipts used in the funding of the Capital Programme.

#### 4.5 **Industrial Estate**

The movement in part reflects the anticipated restoration costs that will be met from the reserve due to the expiration of the North Walsham industrial estate lease in 2009. The projected balance is being held in the event that other managed properties may require restoration.

#### 4.6 **Capital Funding Reserve**

The reduction reflects funding of the 2009/10 Capital Programme and the balance will be used to fund future Capital Programmes.

#### 4.7 **Affordable Housing & County Strategic Partnership Reserve**

This represents monies not yet spent in accordance with the agreement reached through the Norfolk Local Government Association.

#### 4.8 **Potential Pension Liability Provision**

This represents monies set aside for the potential pension liability arising from the transfer of staff to the Norfolk & Waveney Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust.

#### 4.9 **Redundancy & Pension Reserve**

This relates to funding for anticipated costs arising from the restructuring of services.

#### 4.10 **Modern Reward Strategy Reserve**

The reserve is to assist with the implementation of the Single Status Agreement and includes funds set aside for additional Modern Reward Strategy project team costs, which may arise in 2009/10.

#### 4.11 **Strategic Ambitions Reserve**

Formerly the "Invest to Save/ Invest to Improve Reserve", this was renamed the Strategic Ambitions Reserve during 2008/09 to reflect that the reserve is to be used to promote and progress the Council's strategic ambitions. Consideration will also be given to drawing down funds from the reserve on an invest to save basis where such investment supports delivery of the strategic ambitions.

#### 4.12 **Modern Reward Strategy Provision**

The payments relating to the Modern Reward Strategy were not made during 2008/09 so, the forecast reflects the funding set aside for both 2007/08 and 2008/09.

#### 4.13 **Organisational Change Reserve**

At its meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> February 2009, County Council approved the use of the remaining balances on the LPSA Pump Priming and Interest Equalisation Reserves for other purposes. The combined balances were placed in a new "Organisational Change Reserve" and it was agreed that £0.605M would be used to fund the one-off cost of the June 2009 elections. The remaining balance will be used to provide one-off funding to support and invest in the transformational change e.g. shared services, which the Council faces from 2010 onwards. Such change will be necessary to meet the expected very tight squeeze on our finances irrespective of whether or not Local Government Review happens. At its meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> September 2009, Cabinet approved the use of up to £0.300M to meet the costs of the forthcoming review of management structures across the County Council.

## 5. Capital Budget 2009/10 update

5.1 The forecast 2009/10 capital out-turn is summarised in the table below.

### Capital Budget Outturn 2009/10

Department	Budget 2009/10	Forecast Out-turn	Movement to future years/ underspend
	£M	£M	£M
Chief Executive's (ICT)	2.059	2.059	0.000
Offices	5.527	5.527	0.000
Property Management	0.291	0.291	0.000
Corporate Minor Works	0.953	0.953	0.000
Total	<u>8.830</u>	<u>8.830</u>	<u>0.000</u>

5.2 The budget for 2009/10 is the approved budget adjusted for 2008/09 slippage.

5.3 **Corporate Minor Works:** the budget represents the total Corporate Minor Works budget which is allocated out to specific projects in departments during the course of the year.

## 6. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

6.1 This report is not directly relevant to equality, in that it is not making proposals that will have a direct impact on equality of access or outcomes for diverse groups.

## 7. Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

7.1 There are no direct implications of this report for the S17 Crime and Disorder Act.

## 8. Action required

8.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is asked to comment on the report and consider any actions that may be needed.

### Officer Contacts:

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Harvey Bullen 01603 223330

Linda Bainton 01603 223024



If you need this Report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Harvey Bullen or Linda Bainton on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.



**\* Score Key**

★ Performance is at or better than target

● Performance is within 5% of target

▲ Performance is more than 5% worse than target

Data reported quarterly					
	Actual 08/09	Target 09/10	2nd Quarter	Score *	Comment
Customer care standards: Telephone enquiries - % answered within 15 seconds	-	90%	96.83	★	-
Customer care standards: Email enquiries - % answered within 3 working days	-	70%	77.04	★	-
Customer care standards: Visitors - % seen within 5 mins	-	95%	96.21	★	-
Customer care standards: Letters & faxes - % answered within 10 working days	-	70%	85.42	★	Not yet including data from Cultural Services although systems are being put in place to provide full data for Quarter 4.
Value for Money - total net value of on-going cash-releasing value for money gains that have impacted since the start of the 2008-09 financial year (£m) (NI179)	£14,65m	£14.00m	£14.00m (year end projection)	★	-
% invoices paid by authority within 30 days	96.50	90	95.80	★	-
Value of orders processed through iProc (£)	£103m	£135m	£91.676m	★	-
Forecast budget spend against Revenue budget (£)	-£0.459m (-0.09%)	0 to -0.5%	-£2.308m (-0.41%)	★	-
Forecast budget spend against adjusted Capital budget (£)	- £34.485 m (- 18.3%)	0 to -10%	£0.106m (0.05%)	●	A small overspend is currently forecast although it is anticipated that by the end of the year there will be an overall underspend. This is due to slippage on schemes, which is usually reported in the third and fourth quarters.

Data reported quarterly					
	Actual 08/09	Target 09/10	2nd Quarter	Score *	Comment
Average number of days employee sickness	9.18	8.5	1.34	★	Cumulative figure/Qtr 2 profile is 3.68%.  Data reported for the end of Q2 is likely to be under reporting the actual position. However, a refresh of Q1 data shows that we are within 5% of target. Given the potential impact of pandemic flu, this will remain a challenging target over the next 2 quarters.
% Employee turnover	12.19	12.00	5.07	★	Cumulative figure/Qtr 2 profile is 6.84%.  Turnover continues to decline and predicted turnover is now expected to be around 10.5%, down from 12.19% in 2008/09.
% Employees with a disability	2.13	2.54	2.06	▲	The number of declared disabled staff continues to decline. Current actions include publicising the routes by which staff can declare their status, and carrying out a mystery shopping exercise on recruitment of disabled applicants during Q3 to investigate this issue further.
% Employees from black and minority ethnic communities	1.41	1.45	1.45	★	We have achieved our 2009/10 target ahead of schedule, and this reflects steady improvement in this area over the last couple of years. Data on 'White Other' employees shows a slight drop in this quarter for the first time since monitoring began in 2008/09.

**\* Score Key**

- ★ Performance is at or better than target
- Performance is within 5% of target
- ▲ Performance is more than 5% worse than target

## **Service and Budget Planning 2010-13**

Report by the Director of Corporate Resources and Head of Finance

### **Executive Summary**

This report sets out the main planning considerations for the services covered by this overview and scrutiny panel and the context in which they are set. This includes the financial position and the relevant performance and improvement considerations that relate to the council's delivery of its corporate objectives.

It also sets out the overall funding prospects and spending pressures for the service and the draft, potential savings options for the 2010/11 service budget.

### **The main issues and areas for consideration affecting the services covered by this panel include:**

The need to continue to provide effective support to the organisation, maintain our good financial standing and provide adequate investment to meet key legislative and policy changes, measured against ensuring that front line services are protected as far as possible.

The report sets out all these factors but, in particular, members may wish to consider:

- Efficiency savings through the support services review to meet inflationary increases across all services
- The financial implications for the council of meeting new safeguarding legislation
- The additional revenue funding needed to implement the approved County Farms Policy
- Proposed capital funding to support projects to reduce energy usage
- The overall medium term financial position and challenges ahead.

### **Overview and Scrutiny Panel members are asked to consider and comment on:**

- the planning assumptions and how these are applied,
- the proposed spending pressures and savings set out in the appendices
- any specific issues on the proposed list of new and amended capital schemes to be evaluated within the capital prioritisation model as part of the review of the three-year capital programme.

# 1. Background

- 1.1. This discussion takes place in a financial climate for public services that has been widely described as 'dire' as a consequence of the national economic downturn. Though we know our level of Government grant for 2010/11, we don't know what it will be for the following two years. For planning purposes, therefore, we are assuming there will be no increases in grant levels over this period. Since it is clear that the newly elected government will need to take drastic action to cut public spending in order to re-balance the country's finances.
- 1.2. In the light of such challenges, the Leader and Cabinet have agreed an organisational blueprint that describes how this council intends to develop its operations over the coming four years to become a more responsive, efficient and streamlined organisation, focused on frontline services with increased value for money.
- 1.3. In addition, to help local people manage through the recession, the administration has assured Norfolk council tax payers that we will freeze the level of council tax for at least two of the next four years and, where we levy any increase, it will not be higher than the level of inflation.
- 1.4. Our planning for next year and the years to follow takes place within a clear framework and process agreed by Cabinet.
- 1.5. In August, Cabinet received and agreed a report<sup>1</sup> that set out the planning context, requirements and parameters that services should use to steer their service planning. It confirmed as the authority's strategic intentions, the strategic ambitions, corporate objectives, values and key improvement areas set out in the County Council Plan 2008-11 and the outcomes we should focus on in our planning.
- 1.6. We deliver the County Council Plan through 34 detailed service plans which set out our service needs, outcomes, actions, targets, assessment of value for money and capacity. When we prepare them, we also consider the external and internal drivers for change, such as financial and economic predictions, performance and value for money, risks, customer needs and the impact of our services on the people of Norfolk.

Cabinet asked that we prepare draft service and financial planning requirements and budget options for discussion by county councillors in the November Overview and Scrutiny Panels and public consultation.

- 1.7. This paper sets out the planning issues and requirements relevant to the services covered by this Overview and Scrutiny Panel, together with a summary of the relevant corporate assumptions that underpin them. It also puts forward from the Cabinet Member in association with the service Chief Officer, some draft proposals for consultation based upon the financial parameters set by Cabinet in August.

---

<sup>1</sup> Service and Financial Planning 2010/11 to 2012/13 – Report to Cabinet 10 August 2009

## **The strategic and corporate context**

1.8. The County Council Plan 2008-11 sets out our three Strategic Ambitions for Norfolk, which are closely aligned to the Norfolk County Strategic Partnership Vision. The ambitions are for Norfolk to be:

- An inspirational place with a clear sense of identity
- With a vibrant, strong and sustainable economy
- And aspirational people with high levels of achievement and skills;

It also sets out our nine Corporate Objectives (priorities) and our three cross-cutting Organisational Objectives, with the main areas where we want to improve, together with the targets set to help us know we have done so.

1.9. Each year we also assess the background and context for the County Council's work. Internal and external factors can affect our work positively or negatively and are factored into plans for how we provide our services and the implications for resources. Significant issues affecting County Council services during this planning period are outlined in Appendix A, but matters relevant to the corporate context include:

- **The impact of the recession**

1.10. Like many other organisations, the recession is biting in a number of ways. For example, from a financial point of view our plans must reflect, in particular, less investment income, due to lower interest rates. However, unlike some organisations, demand for services is higher than ever, particularly in the demand led caring services and our service plans will need to consider this. We report progress on the Council's response to the economic downturn on a regular basis to the Economic Development and Cultural Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

- **The new organisational blueprint for Norfolk County Council and its implementation programme - Norfolk Forward.**

1.11. A review of senior management structures is already underway and scheduled to report in December. The identified costs and savings associated with any agreed recommendations will be factored in to budget planning later in the process when the outcome is known.

1.12. As already reported to Cabinet in September, the costs of managing and operating the programme office, which will oversee the implementation of Norfolk Forward, are being contained within existing resources

- **Managing our performance**

1.13. Our planning must reflect the elements of the performance framework for local government, including the Local Area Agreement (LAA), the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA), the National Indicator Set and implications for increased partner working including shared resources.

- 1.14. Under the final round of the former Corporate Performance Assessment (CPA) inspection regime (2008), the Audit Commission assessed the council as 'excellent' awarding us 4 out of 4 possible stars. This tells us that on the whole, we are delivering effective and good value services.
- 1.15. This year, the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) has replaced CPA. CAA assesses how well public services are working together to meet the needs and aspirations of their communities and using their resources to meet identified needs and deliver the outcomes set in the Local Area Agreement for Norfolk. In reaching its judgement, the Audit Commission also draws upon those judgements made by other inspectorates, such as Ofsted, to help reach its conclusions. The first CAA report for Norfolk will be published in December.
- 1.16. Inspection assessments on individual services and organisations are ongoing. The Audit Commission will publish the 2009 Performance and Organisational Assessment reports in December.
- 1.17. In addition, service and budget planning needs to take account of the challenging targets and outcomes agreed by partners in Norfolk Action, the Local Area Agreement (LAA) for Norfolk.

- **Modern Reward Strategy**

- 1.18. Previous budgets provided for the impact of implementing the Modern Reward Strategy Project (MRS), which will introduce new pay scales and pay-related conditions of employment for approximately 16,000 County Council employees (teachers and fire-fighters are excluded).
- 1.19. Though MRS has been delayed as a result of the time taken to pursue a collective agreement with Unison nationally, the authority is keen to implement its proposals with effect from April 2010 and Members of the Personnel Committee asked that the necessary steps be taken to secure this. The recent Unison and Unite ballots resulted in a "yes" vote, which means that the proposals can now be implemented through a collective agreement.

- **Carbon Reduction Commitment**

- 1.20. The Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) is an obligatory emissions trading scheme covering both public and private sectors. We will need to comply with the new scheme, which commences in April 2010, including ensuring we have adequate resources to procure the trading allowances and deliver energy efficient solutions. We are assessing how much money we will need to set aside to purchase allowances and budgeting for this corporately. The scheme will include an annual performance league table, with financial incentives and penalties based on our performance. To compare well against other organisations, plans need to consider energy usage and include ways of exploiting options to reduce it.

## **2. Financial context 2010 - 2013**

- 2.1. The detailed assessment of financial prospects for 2010-13 is set out in the August report to Cabinet. It is necessarily a funding forecast for planning purposes only and we will continue to review it.
- 2.2. The Government has indicated that the previously announced grant settlement for 2010/11 (an increase of £12.0m) will be honoured. However, the Comprehensive Spending Review 2010 scheduled to cover the three years from 2011/12 has been deferred until after the General Election. This means we cannot be clear about financial prospects beyond the end of the next financial year (2010/11). For *planning purposes*, we are assuming a grant freeze for 2011/12 and 2012/13.
- 2.3. We are also assuming that there will be no change to the 'grant damping' arrangements. This is the adjustment the Government makes to Norfolk's calculated grant entitlement in order to compensate some other councils, which suffered a loss in grant when a new distribution formula was introduced in 2006/07. Over the past four years 2006/07 to 2009/10, Norfolk has had its grant adjusted downwards by a total of £96.8m.
- 2.4. In the light of the administration's pledge to keep tax increases within the level of inflation and freeze council tax in two of the next four years, *for planning purposes* we have assumed a council tax increase of 2% for 2010/11 and a tax freeze for 2011/12 and 2012/13.
- 2.5. Based on these assumptions our current net revenue budget of £559.9m, would increase by £18.9m in 2010/11 and then stay at that level for 2011/12 and 2012/13.
- 2.6. After allowing for funding of new external borrowing for the Capital Programme, Chief Officers were asked to approach their service and financial planning assuming a 2.5% budget increase in 2010/11 and no increase in 2011/12 and 2012/13. Following further consideration of the provision for pay inflation to be included in budgets for 2010/11, the Leader has requested this uplift to be adjusted to reflect an assumed pay freeze in 2010/11, for all awards still to be negotiated. For planning purposes only at this stage provision for a 2.25% pay increase remains for 2011/12 and 2012/13. Typically, additional cost pressures arising from inflation, demographic growth and new legal requirements total £50m each year. In 2010/11, the projected cost pressures are in excess of £43m, most of which is due to demand and demographic increases (£24m), inflationary pressures (£7m) and costs arising from changes in government legislation (£5m). As a consequence, we require considerable and ongoing cost savings if we are to sustain services and budgets over the medium term.

## **3. Service specific - strategic context**

- 3.1. In addition to the above, the Director of Corporate Resources has identified the following as being of particular significance for this Panel:

- **Support Services Review:** In 2007, Cabinet agreed the model for sharing support services. This work continues with full implementation of the agreed model underway for ICT, more detailed business cases being prepared for procurement, and Finance and HR scoping of full implementation.
- **Independent Safeguarding Authority:** The County Council has new legal responsibilities from October 2009 as a result of the introduction of the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006. The Act requires that over a five year period all employees and volunteers engaged in delivering in a direct way (regulated) activities to vulnerable groups will be registered with the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA).
- **Revised policy for County Farms:** In September 2008, a working group nominated by the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee published a report and a series of recommendations regarding the management of the County Council's rural estate (details are given at 6.2 below).

## 4. Financial and service planning for next year (2010/2011)

### 4.1. Corporate assumptions

All the County Council's consultation proposals use a set of common, corporate assumptions as a means of balancing the budget for 2010/11.

These assumptions are set out below in the interests of fairness and consistency. We invite Members views on the assumptions and the principle that they should be applied corporately in each case, as part of their consideration of these service proposals.

- **Cash uplifts for services**

- 4.2. Services have been asked to plan on the basis of an assumed budget increase of 2.5%, less an adjustment for the revised assumptions for pay, within which increased costs and pressures should be managed.

The adjusted uplift for this panel is £4.314m, of which £3.7m is for the forecast additional cost of net interest payable from additional borrowing needed to deliver the planned capital programme.

- **Absorbing inflationary pressures**

- 4.3. A planning assumption has been made that departments will absorb inflationary pressures of 2% for general prices. This will apply to both expenditure and income budgets.

The exceptions to this are:

A proposed 4% cash uplift for home to school transport costs.



A proposed 4% cash uplift for passenger transport services provided via the PTU for Adult Social Services.

The impact of these assumptions on the services being considered by this panel is that basic price inflation of £0.167m will need to be absorbed. In addition, we are continuing to forecast an increase in insurance costs, which reflects a national increase in the cost of claims. These will be met from planned savings.

- **Staff costs**

- 4.4. We are assuming that there will be no nationally negotiated pay increase next year for the public sector with the possible exception of staff whose pay is subject to agreement by national pay review bodies such as teachers and fire-fighters.

The impact of this assumption on the services being considered by this panel is that there is no pay increase included in the budget planning proposals.

- **Payments to independent and voluntary providers**

- 4.5. We are assuming that independent and voluntary providers will likewise absorb inflationary pressures. We are not providing for any inflationary uplift for 2010/11.

There are no contracts with independent and voluntary providers for services being considered by this panel.

- **Sharper commissioning**

- 4.6. We are assuming that commissioning arrangements will be reviewed where appropriate to ensure spending and services align with the council's priorities and deliver value for money. This will mean de-commissioning (ending) some automatic funding of some grants or services that may be nice to have, but are not directly aligned to the council's priorities for service users and so cannot be afforded as a priority.

- **Tough purchasing**

- 4.7. We are assuming that goods and services will continue to be procured as efficiently as possible, driving down costs for Norfolk taxpayers whilst retaining quality.

The Corporate Procurement unit has over the past two years contributed £2.3m worth of savings and, has demonstrated the effectiveness of good procurement by continually challenging current procurement models. This year will again see the unit deliver £1m worth of savings and once the new model of procurement has been implemented, we can expect an increased pace of savings delivery.

- **Efficiency**

- 4.8. The authority has an ongoing responsibility to reduce costs and improve efficiency. All planning is based on this understanding. We are on target to have delivered efficiencies of over £85m over the past six years by March 2010. The efficiency target set by government for next year is 4%. This requires us to find a further £19m savings. No service specific targets have been set; we are assuming and expecting all services to contribute towards the achievement of the total.

The impact of this assumption on the services being considered by this panel is that we are progressing with a number of support services reviews that are challenging how we are currently providing back office services and looking to implement more efficient and effective ways of working. In 2010-11, £546,000 of our proposed £586,000 savings are from efficiencies through reviewing contracts, increasing income, reducing low priority spend, and reviewing how we deliver ICT support services and customer services. Further reviews are underway including Procurement and Finance and, when identified, savings will be factored into budget plans for future years.

- **Realistic charging**

- 4.9. We are assuming that subsidies, fees and other charges are reviewed where possible and relevant to reflect changed economic circumstances and expectations, other forms of grant or income or any significant changes in price, market or service.

The impact of this assumption on the services being considered by this panel is that the income budgets held within Finance General, including the income received from Norse and in relation to the Airport Industrial Estate, will be reviewed to reflect current expectations of future income.

- **Capital**

- 4.10. In February, schemes and funding were considered within a three-year capital programme as part of the County Council Plan 2009-12 (Appendix B). We have not made assumptions about the allocation of capital at this stage, however, it is assumed that capital bids are identified following option appraisal and that these will be evaluated by the Corporate Capital and Asset Management Group (CCAMG). These will be evaluated alongside existing schemes using the capital prioritisation model and recommendations for any revision to the programme will be reported to January Overview and Scrutiny Panels. The revenue consequences of capital spending (financing charges and changes in operational costs) have been incorporated within our financial planning.

The approved schemes and new bids relevant to this overview and scrutiny panel are listed in Appendix C.

## **5. The principal challenges for this service**

- 5.1. Performance against key indicators is continuously monitored. Identified risks associated with service delivery are also regularly monitored and reviewed and corporately significant risks are reported to Audit Committee. Regular reports against performance and budget targets are provided to this Panel and current performance information on corporate health indicators is provided in a separate report on this agenda.
- 5.2. We use a range of benchmarking data to monitor and check our performance against other county councils and, for example, we use CIPFA benchmarking to monitor our performance against other county councils for financial services such as income collection, payments, accounting and treasury management.
- 5.3. The principal challenges facing the services covered by this Overview and Scrutiny Panel, which need to be taken into account when assessing the budget proposals and preparing the 2010/11 service plan include:
  - Overall our performance is good, however, we recognise that we need to ensure that we are as efficient as possible so that resources can be directed to front line services.
  - Balancing the need to minimise the back office with the need to maintain a solid corporate framework that effectively delivers core services such as democratic services, ICT, buildings and, the financial stability that services need to deliver services properly.
  - The need to continue to respond to legislative requirements, for example, those placed upon us by the new Independent Safeguarding Authority and making adequate financial provision for statutory surveys.
  - The need to consider our energy usage and find ways of exploiting options to reduce it and to meet NCC's carbon reduction commitment.
  - The main risks being managed in relation to the above challenges are around the implementation of the Support Services Review and realisation of savings and benefits from it, ensuring sufficient capacity for change including developing and training staff to meet the demands of new ways of working, delivering the new independent safeguarding authority requirements and securing resources to meet the carbon reduction commitment.

## **6. Draft revenue proposals for this overview and scrutiny panel 2010 – 2011**

- 6.1. The following proposals are brought forward by the Cabinet Member in association with the service Chief Officer for consultation purposes and views are welcome. The proposals are listed in full in Appendix B.

6.2. The budget proposals attached include expected cost pressures of £5.531m in 2010-11 and for planning purposes we are assuming a budget uplift of £4.314m. £588,000 of the identified costs is in relation to inflationary pressures. Savings totalling £500,000 have been proposed to help manage these costs, of which £460,000 are through efficiencies. The key cost pressures to meet the challenges identified are detailed below, including expected outcomes and risks.

- We are forecasting that demands on the Insurance Fund will continue to increase and budget planning proposals have included a £100,000 increase for each of the next two years. This reflects a national increase in the costs of insurance claims over and above the rate of inflation.
- New legislation has created the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA). Its role is to help prevent unsuitable people from working with children and vulnerable adults.
- Last year, Cabinet Scrutiny Committee Working Group carried out work to review the County Farms Policy. In March this year, Cabinet agreed the recommendations of the group, which changed the current policy of using the estate as a source of income that has, in the past, supported delivering other council priorities. The new policy aims to recognise the County Farm assets for the benefits that the Estate can directly provide to the Council's objectives.
- The capital programme approved in February 2009 included future year new starts. The additional borrowing costs needed in 2010-11 to meet the planned capital programme are £3.730m.
- Replacing the current public address system in the Council Chamber will cost £38,000. This is a one-off cost and can be removed from the budget in 2011-12.
- The cost of carrying out the bi-annual statutory place survey is £25,000. This is also a one-off cost and the medium term proposals remove this from the budget in 2011-12.

6.3. The proposals do not provide a balanced position overall for the services covered by this Panel. The pressures relate to the delivery of key legislative and policy changes for the Council and further savings of £621,000 are needed to be able to meet these costs from within Corporate Resources' services.

6.4. New capital bids for 2010-11 total £3.040m. The bids are all in relation to property and include:

- £130,000 to meet work necessary to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act.
- £250,000 to support additional improvements to seven primary school development projects to meet BREEAM specification. This will enable the council to ensure that these projects do meet the specification.

- An additional £60,000 is bid to increase the funding already within the programme for corporate minor works.
- £2.6m is included to provide funding for the Carbon and Energy Reduction Fund, which will support work across the Council to reduce our usage of carbon and meet our own targets for energy usage and, will also help mitigate against the longer term financial and reputational risks to the Council when the Carbon Reduction Commitment is operational in 2011-12.

Taking the Council budget as a whole, there is presently an overall shortfall in the savings requirements of some £5m based upon the proposals set out in all Scrutiny Panel reports. Work is ongoing to identify where further savings can be made, there are also some other budgetary pressures, which need to be finalised. For example, we need to make provision in 2010/11 for any projected loss on our Icelandic Bank investments. Latest information from the banks' administrators suggests that could be some £6m. We are also at the present time waiting to hear the outcome of our submission to enter the next round of Building Schools for the Future. The Council will need to agree how we meet this overall shortfall and other pressures not included within panel reports at this stage while still making progress on meeting our nine corporate objectives. Further information will be reported to Panel meetings in January.

## **7. 2011/12 and 2012/13**

- 7.1. As reported to Cabinet in August we expect typically that the County Council will be incurring additional cost pressures of some £50m in each year. Within the attached service schedules some cost pressures for 2011/12 and 2012/13 have been identified. These will be kept under ongoing review.

## **8. Resource Implications**

- 8.1. The implications to resources including, financial, staff, property and IT are set out in Sections 6 and 7 of this report and within the Appendices.

## **9. Other Implications (where appropriate)**

- 9.1. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA):** The budget proposals include investment to support delivery of projects in the programme or work to implement the Council's equality strategy, which will have a positive impact on equality and cohesion.

## **10. Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act (this must be included)**

- 10.1. There are no direct implications of this report for the Section 17, Crime and Disorder Act.

## 11. Action Required

- 11.1. In light of the contextual issues presented and key challenges, overview and scrutiny panel members are asked to consider and comment on the planning assumptions and how these are applied, and the proposed spending pressures and savings set out in Appendix B, in order to inform Cabinet members' discussions.
- 11.2. Members are also asked to consider and identify any specific issues on the proposed list of new and amended capital schemes to be evaluated within the capital prioritisation model as part of the review of the three-year capital programme. The recommended capital programme will be reported to the January meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

## Background Papers

"Service and Financial Planning 2010/11 to 2012/13" – Report to Cabinet, 10 August 2009.

"County Farms Policy" – Report to Cabinet, 2 March 2009.

## Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Harvey Bullen Tel No. 01603-223330 harvey.bullen@norfolk.gov.uk

Susanne Baldwin Tel No.01603-224427 susanne.baldwin@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Harvey Bullen 01603 223330 or Textphone 0844 8008011 and we will do our best to help.

## PLANNING CONTEXT

1. Key **demographic changes**, include:
  - Norfolk's population is growing faster than the regional average
  - We have increasing numbers of active older people – 81% of our over 85 year olds still live at home – raising implications for housing, independence and rising demand for the provision of care
  - Norfolk is becoming more diverse, with rapidly increasing black and ethnic minority populations – already around 100 languages are spoken
  - There are large and growing numbers of people from Europe living and working in areas of the county.
  
2. **Socio-economic factors**, such as:
  - Norfolk does have pockets of both rural and urban deprivation, and although the majority of people living in the county are not disadvantaged, 19% of children live in income deprived households
  - Generally good levels of health and higher than average life expectancy but there are people within our communities experiencing increasing inequalities in health and well-being, frequently correlating to areas of greatest deprivation in the county – for example teenage pregnancy
  - Obesity levels in the county continue to be of concern, with children's obesity being of particular concern; diseases normally seen in obese adults are becoming more common in children
  - Levels of adult participation in sport and active recreation in Norfolk remain much lower than in other parts of the country
  - Despite overall levels of crime falling in Norfolk, local people's perception of crime as an issue remains high.
  
3. Factors affecting **Norfolk's economy and skills**, including:
  - The current economic downturn is affecting employment and development nationally. Latest unemployment figures for Norfolk (as at mid August) show an increase in the number of people claiming job seekers allowance.
  - Norfolk already has one of the country's most significant financial service sectors, but our overall economic growth lags behind the regional average
  - Basic literacy levels in the county are below national and regional levels
  - Low wage and skills mean that that we need to create and attract more higher value jobs, such as jobs in knowledge-based industries
  - High and volatile price of crude oil impacts on the price of many oil derived materials

- It is expected that Norfolk will see 78,000 new homes built and 55,000 new jobs created by 2021, with significant numbers of people travelling to work by car.

4. **Environmental factors**, such as:

- Local Government has been identified as having a key role in tackling climate change and developing a strategy to support the UK Climate Change Programme, by cutting all greenhouse gases and carbon dioxide emissions – this presents us with a significant leadership challenge as well as delivery of improvements to our own operations
- Climate change and water resources are of major concern in the county, with challenges around issues of coastal erosion, storm damage and flooding – and increasing severity of emergencies caused by natural occurrences
- Moving towards paperless transactions in order to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill
- The Government intends to introduce five-year carbon budgets which may be set alongside other operational, funding and taxation policies and are likely to affect expectations of standards and targets as part of the assessment of services, to encourage investment in low-carbon fuels and technologies.

5. **Advances in the use of technology**, including:

- Convergence of voice and data services over broadband networks to support increasing use of mobile and home working facilities
- Increased use of mobile devices such as laptops
- Switchover from analogue to digital television in 2012 means that many more people could access services in diverse ways, such as via the internet using their television
- As part of the Waste Strategy for England 2007, we may have to make further progress with technologies relating to landfill diversion and increasing recycling at home.
- Maximising technologies available to enable safe independent living.

6. **National policy and government legislation**, such as:

- Putting People First – the Government’s shared vision for the transformation of Adult Social Care – including establishing community based support systems for the health and wellbeing of local populations, through bringing together and re-designing (health and care) local systems around the needs of citizens
- Care Matters: Time to deliver for children in care and Children & Young Persons Bill – the Government’s expectations of the right quality care and support being in place for children in the care system
- Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods – the Government’s national strategy for dealing with housing in an aging society



## Revenue Budget Planning - Spending Pressures and Savings 2010-13

### Corporate Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Description of cost pressures or service improvement - shown against the key driver	2010-11 £k	2011-12 £k	2012-13 £k	Corporate Objective and Risk assessment of key impact to performance, value for money, equality, environment, workforce etc.
<b>Budget Uplift for planning purposes only</b>	<b>4,314</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>COST PRESSURES AND SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS</b>				
<b>Basic Inflation - Pay (2010-11 - 0%; 2011-13 -2.25%)</b>	0	449	459	
<b>Basic Inflation - Prices (General 2%, School and social care passenger transport 4%)</b>	367	380	394	
<b>Additional Inflation - Pay</b>				
Additional 0.7% contribution to Pensions (1% for 2011-13 years)	121	175	177	
Additional 0.5% increase in NI Employers contributions in 2011-12		74		
<b>Additional Inflation - Prices</b>				
Finance general : Additional insurance costs	100	100		Organisational Objective: Value for Money: to ensure adequate provision for increased cost of insurance claims
<b>Sub Total Inflation</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>1,178</b>	<b>1,030</b>	
<b>Government/Legislative requirements</b>				
Independent Safeguarding Authority	150	200		Corporate Objectives: Safety and Health and Well-being: To ensure that workforce complies with new safeguarding legislation.
<b>Sub Total Legislative</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Costs specific to meeting service strategies and improvements</b>				
Implementation of County Farms Working Group recommendations	1,000	245	320	Corporate Objectives: Protect and sustain the environment; development of the Norfolk economy:
Finance General net interest payable/receivable	3,730			
Replacement of public address system for the council chamber	38			Corporate objectives: Community.
Place Survey	25			Corporate objectives: Community; Customer Focus; Value for Money
<b>Sub Total Service Improvement</b>	<b>4,793</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>320</b>	
<b>TOTAL COST PRESSURES AND SERVICE IMPROVEMENT</b>	<b>5,531</b>	<b>1,623</b>	<b>1,350</b>	

<b>Proposed action</b>	<b>2010-11 Estimated Saving (£k)</b>	<b>2011-12 Estimated Saving (£k)</b>	<b>2012-13 Estimated Saving (£k)</b>	<b>Corporate Objective and Risk assessment of key impact to performance, value for money, equality, environment, workforce etc.</b>
<b>Savings that do not impact on current policy</b>				
Chief executive: Review IT contracts	63			Org Objective: Value For Money: No impact on performance
Chief Executive: Increased registrars Fee Income	8			Corporate Objective: Community: No impact on performance or access to service
Finance General: Efficiencies - review of income budgets	56			Org Objective: Value For Money: No impact on performance
Chief Executive: Political Assistant Post	40			Post no longer required
Chief Executive: County Council Lunches	12			Org Objective: Value For Money: No impact on performance
Chief Executive: Cancellation of annual media lunch	4			Org Objective: Value For Money: No impact on performance
Chief Executive: Customer Service Centre Efficiencies	107			Org Objective: Customer focus - No impact on performance
Chief Executive: ICT Support Services Review	200			Org Objective: Value For Money: No impact on performance
Chief Executive: Local Government Association savings		96		Org Objective: Value For Money: No impact on performance
Chief Executive: Establish a single coroner's district for Norfolk	10			Corporate Objective: Safety - No impact on performance
Chief Executive: Replacement of public address system - one off		38		
Chief Executive: Places Survey - one off		25		
<b>TOTAL SAVINGS</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>0</b>	

## Appendix C

### Capital priorities for Funding from Corporate Capital

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13 +</b>	<b>Total</b>
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
<b>Approved as part of the 2009-10 capital prioritisation</b>					
<b><i>Corporate Property</i></b>					
Corporate Minor Works	900	1,180	1,220		3,300
Customer Access Enhancements - County Hall	177	38	61		276
<b>Total Approved Schemes</b>	<b>1,077</b>	<b>1,218</b>	<b>1,281</b>		<b>3,576</b>

#### **New Bids**

Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) works		130	130	130	390
Seven Primary school Development projects - Supplementary improvements in BREEAM specification		250	200	200	650
Corporate Minor Works		60	50	1,270	1,380
Carbon & Energy Reduction Fund (CERF)		2,600	2,825	6,800	12,225
<b>Total new bids</b>		<b>3,040</b>	<b>3,205</b>	<b>8,400</b>	<b>14,645</b>

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13 +</b>	<b>Total</b>
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k

#### **Approved as part of the 2009-10 capital prioritisation**

##### ***Chief Executives***

Asbestos survey & removal programme	722	722	722		2,166
<b>Total Approved Schemes</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>722</b>		<b>2,166</b>

#### **New Bids**

No bids have been put forward for  
2010-11

**Corporate Health & Safety Mid- Year Report for 2008/2009**

Report by the Corporate Health & Safety Manager

**Summary**

This report provides updated information on the Corporate Health and Safety Plan for 2008/09.

All departments are on track to complete their action plans by the end of the year.

To date the incidents being reported across the authority indicate a reduction in numbers, with some departments such as Planning and Transportation comparative figures showing a 44% reduction in the last quarter.

There are a number of activities underway to further improve the personal safety of staff, with both Adult Social Services and Children's Services undertaking significant reviews in this area.

Planning and Transportation have also embarked on a project to better control the risk of Hand Arm Vibration Syndrome which should also have a very positive effect on the incident statistics.

Corporate progress on the objectives for the year is also on track particularly in relation to increased monitoring visits and improvements to corporate health and safety training.

Use of the Occupational Health and Employee Assistance (Norfolk Support Line and Musculoskeletal Rehabilitation Scheme) contracts continues to remain steady. All three contracts are being reviewed this year and the two re-tender processes that have taken place so far have ensured we receive value for money and return on our investments along with development in service provision.

Updated incident figures show a return to the 2006/07 levels, this is slightly disappointing after the reduction in incidents recorded last year, but in real terms only equates to an increase of 13.

The panel are asked to consider and comment on the Corporate Health and Safety update report.

## **1. Background**

- 1.1 The Corporate Health and Safety Report and Action Plan was presented to the Chief Officers Group and the Corporate Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Panel in July 2009. This report contains an update on the information reported and the progress towards the Action Plan made to date. It is not the intention to re-present the original report.

## **2. Points of significance for the year to date for each Department**

### **2.1 Adult Social Services**

- 2.1.1 The current plan is on schedule for completion on time.
- 2.1.2 The Health and Safety Adviser is currently undertaking a joint project with UNISON to review violent incident reports to identify trends in the causes of incidents and to ensure adequate and appropriate control measures are in place. The work of this project and the continued Personal Safety Training which is on-going has resulted in a rise in reporting of incidents as employees become more comfortable about reporting. The investigations have identified that in some areas employees had been under-reporting as they work with people who have learning difficulties, and who present challenging behaviour at times. Feedback is that employees had seen this as part of their job, and therefore, did not previously feel the need to report all events.
- 2.1.3 Monitoring inspections in premises are underway, this year the focus is on service areas where there have been significant changes, to ensure continuity of health & safety responsibilities and actions.
- 2.1.4 The Local Medical Committee has once again given their authority for front line staff to receive flu vaccination via their GP's. Some front line employees have also been identified as being eligible for the Swine flu vaccination. This will not be delivered through GP's and our own clinics are currently being planned and organised.

### **2.2 Chief Executive's, NYOT and Trading Standards**

- 2.2.1 The annual plan is on schedule to be completed by the end of the year including the monitoring inspections target.
- 2.2.2 Personal safety training continues to be a priority for the departments with full and refresher sessions being planned throughout the year.
- 2.2.3 Some areas are also carrying out reviews of their lone worker processes to ensure they remain valid and workable for staff whilst also ensuring their safety.
- 2.2.4 October saw the health and safety service for Connexions move to Children's Services in line with organisational changes.

## **2.3 Children's Services**

- 2.3.1 The annual plan is on schedule to be completed by the end of the year including the monitoring inspections target.
- 2.3.2 Last year saw a reduction in the number of incidents being reported across the department. Current indications are that although levels will not decline further they are on track to remain at last years lower totals.
- 2.3.3 A complete review of the lone worker monitoring systems in place across the department has taken place. Revisions to the current arrangements are now being made and embedded into local procedures. The advisers will continue to monitor the systems in place to ensure they are appropriate.

## **2.4 Cultural Services**

- 2.4.1 The annual plan is on schedule to be completed by end of the year including the monitoring inspections target.
- 2.4.2 Work on developing comprehensive guidance on fire safety including training requirements is on-going and will provide the department and others with a structure to make improvements in this complex area.

## **2.5 Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service**

- 2.5.1 The service has been involved in 2 major inspections in the first half of this year the first by the Audit Commission regarding Key Lines of Enquiry and the second by the Health and Safety Executive as one of eight Fire and Rescue Services inspected in this years national programme. The HSE reviewed operational areas of work such as breathing apparatus training, operational risk information and incident command. Their report was received in October and an action plan to meet their recommendations has been submitted.
- 2.5.2 Work on improving communication with local management teams has taken place enabling the service to cascade risk information through local planning arrangements and if necessary to escalate risk appropriately.
- 2.5.3 Work to improve standard operating procedures for operational activities aligned to a national template has been ongoing; these contain the most recent operational information and are available to crews as they attend incidents.
- 2.5.4 Three significant internal audits on breathing apparatus, operational preparedness and operational risk information have been undertaken.
- 2.5.5 A management review team has been established to review significant internal and external reports arising from operational incidents ensuring the continuous improvement in fire-fighter safety.

## **2.6 Planning and Transportation**

- 2.6.1 Progress is being made in all areas of the action plan for the year. In summary:

- Planned inspections are on target with 18 having been completed to date this year.
- Bi-monthly inspections are taking place with May Gurney & NCC Highway Operations.
- The Make A Difference programme continues with the objective of improving safety behaviours in the department. The latest presentations in the programme have incorporated the HSE "shattered lives" campaign which is aimed at reducing slip and trip accidents. The HSE online posters were issued to managers for use in depots and sections, along with mirror stickers and other materials.
- A programme of improving the assessment and control of Hand Arm Vibration Syndrome (HAVS) continues to be rolled out with new guidance available for managers. A HAVS monitoring system has been procured and is now at all depots and available for other affected groups. Training has been carried out by the manufacturers and all tools are being tagged with the hardware. Installation of the software onto the NCC system should take place in November, and Champions have been identified in each work area. The system as a whole should be fully operational by the end of the year.
- Departmental specific lone working guidance and tracking arrangements have been developed and made available to managers.
- Departmental accident investigation guidance has been developed and made available to managers. Workshops to train managers in their duties to investigate incidents are being delivered across the department. The adviser for the department will continue to review investigation records from managers to evaluate the effectiveness in the guidance and training in improving the quality of incident investigations.

2.6.2 Initial indications are that incident reports for the departments will show a significant downturn from last year. The overall number of incidents in the last quarter show a 44.5% decrease compared to the same period last year.

## **2.7 Corporate Activity**

2.7.1 Work towards the improvement objectives for the year is on track (see appendix 1).

2.7.2 The new Corporate Monitoring Officer has been mainly concentrating on visits to schools on behalf of Children's Services. The visits have been very well received by Headteachers. She has also conducted a number of monitoring visits to construction and maintenance works contracted out through NPS providing both NPS and NCC valuable information about the way in which this sort of work is being conducted. It is estimated that an additional 200 visits will be completed to premises this year as a result of introducing this post. These visits give us a better understanding of how health and safety is being managed across the authority and provide managers and Headteachers with help and advice about health and safety issues.

2.7.3 European Health and Safety Week in October focused on the theme of risk assessment. We used the week to promote the sensible risk message with myth busting calendars and cards. We also promoted the 'safety is everyone's business' concept. During the week the first of our new e-learning packages on health and safety was launched, as was a health and safety matters survey. This is looking at how employees perceive health and safety is being

managed in their areas and if they feel we are concentrating on the right areas. The results of this survey will be reported in next year's annual report.

## **2.8 Occupational Health**

- 2.8.1 Usage of occupational health services continues to be in line with the current service level agreement.
- 2.8.2 A pilot simplified pre-employment health assessment process has been extended to part of Adult Social Services. The revised process aims to ensure that only those applicants who have work-health/health-work issues are required to undertake more detailed assessment by occupational health.
- 2.8.3 Low-level health surveillance training has been rolled out in Adult Social Services. This should enable managers to identify employees who may have skin problem due to wearing latex gloves at an early stage.
- 2.8.4 Health surveillance of schools employees exposed to noise has also commenced.
- 2.8.5 Usage of the musculoskeletal rehabilitation scheme has been approximately 81 referrals per month. Post-treatment satisfaction questionnaires indicate the treatment continues to be of benefit to employees, and it is estimated use of the scheme saves NCC approximately 630 days absence per month.
- 2.8.6 IPRS, current providers of the scheme, were successful in winning the contract for a further 3 years commencing April 2010. The new contract will see improvements to the existing service provided both in terms of value for money and innovation in service.
- 2.8.7 Usage rates of Norfolk Support Line have continued at just below 4%.
- 2.8.8 Following re-tendering of the contract, a new provider has been selected to commence in April 2010. The new provider, Validium, will provide a wider variety of ways for employees to access the scheme, either for advice or counselling.
- 2.8.9 The Corporate Occupational Health Objectives and updated progress are detailed in full in Appendix 1

## **2.9 Wellbeing**

- 2.9.1 A new work life support strategy has been developed and discussed with all departmental management teams. It is hoped that this strategy will be approved by Chief Officers by the end of November enabling the programme to be progressed. The strategy helps fulfil our legal obligations regarding stress management and contributes towards NCC's objectives of :  
"Developing and supporting our workforce", "Improving the health and well-being of Norfolk's residents", and ""Improving opportunities for people to learn throughout life". Initially 100 teams will be identified across NCC to participate in the programme. The teams will be selected working with management teams and departmental HR considering risk factors such as sickness absence and job related stressors.



2.9.2 A number of health and wellbeing awareness days have already taken place across the County and more are planned throughout the remainder of the year. The days are designed to provide employees with information and support in a variety of health improvement areas such as smoking cessation, stress management, nutrition and exercise as well as promoting employee assistance schemes such as Norfolk Support Line and the Musculoskeletal Rehabilitation Scheme.

### 3. Health & Safety Performance

3.1 A summary of Norfolk County Council's performance in managing health and safety based on information from statistical returns was given in the year-end report for 2008/2009. The following is an update on those figures to allow for last minute reports to be included and the latest national figures from the Health and Safety Executive.

Incident Type	Year					
	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09
Over 3 day injury	125	106	98	105	90 (110)	99 (127)
Major	27	22	22	16	18 (21)	22 (25)
Fatality	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non employee taken to hospital	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	86	157*
Reportable Ill health	1	1	0	0	1	13
Reportable Dangerous Occurrence	9	23	14	10	20 (25)	12 (13)
Incidence of RIDDOR accidents to employees per 1000 f.t.e. employees	10.15	8.41	6.07	6.51	5.72 (6.77)	6.5 (7.98)
National Incidence (All Sectors)	6.28	7.05	5.62	5.46	5.23	5.02

TABLE 1. INCIDENTS RECORDED FOR NCC BY YEAR

N.B. The figures provided in brackets include NFRS, these were not reported prior to 2007/08 so have been kept separate to enable comparison.

\* 2 of which were fatalities

3.2 There has been a small increase in the number of reportable injuries this year returning to the 06/07 level. Whilst this is disappointing the increase is not huge (13 incidents), and may be due to the work undertaken by advisers to increase the profile of health and safety and encourage incident reporting.

3.3 However the gap between the national incidence per 1000 employees and that for NCC is disappointingly widening. The national trend is a downward one whereas NCC's is relatively stable.

3.4 It was stated in July that the number of cases of reportable ill health had increased significantly in 2008/09 from the previous year, with the majority of

these being HAVS in Planning and Transportation. As discussed in 2.6.1 Planning and Transportation has developed a programme of work to reduce these incidents and as a result have invested considerably in new technology to better manage and control this risk.

Incident Type	Department						
	ASSD	CEX et al	Children's	Cultural	NFRS	P&T	TOTAL 08/09
Over 3 day injury	39 (22)	1 (4)	39 (49)	2 (5)	28 (20)	18 (10)	<b>127 (110)</b>
Major	3(1)	0 (1)	16 (15)	2 (0)	3 (3)	1 (1)	<b>22 (21)</b>
Fatality	0 (0)	0 (0)	0(0)	0(0)	0 (0)	0(0)	<b>0 (0)</b>
Non employee taken to hospital	1 (0)	0 (0)	154 (82)	2 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	<b>157 (86)</b>
Reportable Ill health	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (0)	<b>13 (1)</b>
Reportable Dangerous Occurrence	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (5)	11 (19)	<b>12 (25)</b>
Incidence of RIDDOR to employees per 1000 f.t.e employees	14.56 (6.53)	1.3 (5.06)	4.09 (4.71)	5.88 (6.07)	32.12 (49.54)	23.26 (12.19)	<b>7.98 (6.77)</b>

TABLE 2. INCIDENTS REPORTED FOR NCC FOR 2007/08 BY DEPARTMENT

N.B. The high number of non-employee injuries in Children's Services is mainly due to PE injuries to pupils. HSE requires all such injuries to be reported.

The figures in brackets are for 2007/08

3.4 The above table shows the same information as the final column of table 1 but by each service or department area.

## 4.0 Other Implications

### 4.1 Legal Implications

Some of the objectives in the plan are set in order to meet the legal obligations of Norfolk County Council. The Council may be vulnerable to legal action if policies and strategies are not kept in line with legal requirements.

### 4.2 Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

An EqIA is undertaken when developing all new and updated health and safety strategies and policies.

### 4.3 Risk Implications/Assessment

If the Authority does not have a robust and proactive health and safety management system there is a risk that the Authority will be exposed to enforcement action and ultimately prosecution.

## **5.0 Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

There are no implications in this report.

## **6.0 Recommendation or Action Required**

The panel are asked to:

- Consider and comment on the Corporate Health and Safety update report

### **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Derryth Wright      Tel No; 01603 222912      [Derryth.Wright@Norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:Derryth.Wright@Norfolk.gov.uk)  
Corporate Health & Safety Manager



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Derryth Wright 01603 222912 or minicom 01603 223833 and we will do our best to help.

## Corporate Health and Safety Plan 2009/2010 - Mid-Year Update November 2009

### Corporate Health and Safety Objectives

Item	Action	End of Year Projected Position	Timescale	Lead	Current position
1.1	Undertake a review of reported slip and trip incidents in order to understand the main causes of such incidents and undertake promotional and other activities to reduce the number of incidents over time	This will be a 2 year project with the analysis of incidents occurring in 2009/10 leading to the drafting of plans and objectives for improvement activity for 2010/11	March 2010	CHSM	On Target
1.2	Implement improvement activities as a result of personal safety survey undertaken in 2008	Departmental Advisers will have reviewed the findings for their department and undertaken detailed investigations as a result. Any improvement activity coming out of this will be programmed into the work plan for 2009/10	March 2010	Departmental Safety Advisers	On Target
1.3	Update Policy and Procedure Formats	A schedule for reviewing and updating all current policies and procedures will be produced and followed.  All new policies and procedures will be produced in the agreed format.	March 2010	CHSM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule produced</li> <li>• Updates on target</li> </ul>
1.4	Review and refresh the Stress management Policy	To ensure it reflects the new worklife support strategy the stress management policy will be	September 2009	Worklife Support Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No yet actioned due to other wellbeing activities taking priority</li> </ul>

Item	Action	End of Year Projected Position	Timescale	Lead	Current position
		reviewed and refreshed.			
1.5	Development of the new Corporate Monitoring Officer role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Appoint to the role</li> <li>▪ Develop a corporate plan of visits with departmental advisers</li> <li>▪ Risk rate all premises visited</li> </ul>	June 2009 June 2009  Ongoing	CHSM with Departmental Advisers	Completed
1.6	Develop and deliver a H&S training strategy and corporate training programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Appoint to the role</li> <li>▪ Develop and agree strategy</li> <li>▪ Develop and deliver corporate training programme</li> </ul>	June 2009 August 2009 Ongoing	CHSM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role Appointed</li> <li>• Strategy not yet in place due to difficulties in recruiting to role</li> </ul>
1.7	Improve the approach to risk assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review the production of risk assessments in line with corporate guidance</li> <li>▪ Develop and deliver risk assessment course for managers</li> </ul>	March 2010  December 2009	Departmental Advisers H&S Training Officer	On Target
1.8	Near Miss Reporting	Review current near miss reporting procedure and make recommendations for improvement	December 2009	CHSM with Departmental Advisers	On Target
1.9	Audit on Incident Reporting including violent incidents	NAS will undertake an audit on incident reporting and in particular management actions and investigations following reports being made.	March 2010	NAS	On Target
1.10	Analysis on H&S Perceptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey monkey questionnaire on perceptions about H&amp;S management developed</li> <li>• Survey undertaken</li> <li>• Results analysed and reports produced for management</li> </ul>	November 2009  January 2010 February 2010	CHSM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey launched in October as part of H&amp;S Week</li> <li>• On Target for completion</li> </ul>

Item	Action	End of Year Projected Position	Timescale	Lead	Current position
		teams <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall results and recommendations reported to HRLT</li> </ul>	March 2010		

## Occupational Health Objectives

Item	Action	End of Year Projected Position	Timescale	Lead	Current position
2.1	Re-tendering Occupational Health management Contracts	All contracts successfully re-tendered prior to current contract expiry	March 2010	Corporate Occupational Health Adviser	2 of the 3 contracts have been re-tendered and providers selected. The third is scheduled to be completed by December 2009.
2.2	Undertake a review of the Occupational Health referral process through comparing the direct and 'via HR' Routes	Review undertaken and recommendations on the way forward made	January 2010	Corporate Occupational Health Adviser	An audit of referrals is currently being undertaken
2.3	Undertake a Review of Long Term Sickness Absence and Occupational Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review undertaken</li> <li>Learning points fed into tender process</li> <li>Learning points fed into departmental and corporate improvement processes</li> </ul>	June 2009 July 2009 December 2009	Corporate Occupational Health Adviser	Review is currently being undertaken
2.4	Undertake a Health Promotion initiative on physical activity to support the National Indicator in this area.	Activity successfully undertaken	March 2010	Corporate Occupational Health Adviser and Worklife Support Officer	General health promotion initiative currently being undertaken which includes physical activity promotion

2.5	Undertake a review of Manual Handling Risk Assessment Guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertake review</li> <li>• Develop new procedures</li> <li>• Promote across NCC to ensure risk assessments are taking place and appropriate controls are in use.</li> </ul>	<p>May 2009 June 2009 August 2009</p>	<p>Corporate Occupational Health Adviser</p>	<p>Review undertaken Policy and procedure currently being drafted</p>
-----	--	---	---	--	---

**Risk Management within Norfolk County Council and the  
Departments of Chief Executives and  
Corporate Finance**

Report by the Chief Executive, Director of Corporate Resources  
and Cultural Services, and Head of Corporate Finance

**Executive summary**

This report updates the Panel on the approach being undertaken to manage risk within the services that report to this Panel, as well as corporately across the authority. Produced in accordance with the authority's Risk Management Framework, this report provides information on the key risks facing the departments and the controls in place to manage them.

In addition, we also present a summary of the risks on the corporate risk register to enable members of this Panel to understand how risks are managed across the authority, whether at departmental or corporate levels.

The corporate risk register is reported regularly to the Audit Committee. It was last reported on 24 September 2009 and the full details are not repeated here.

The key points of this report are:

- The risks within these two services have improved significantly since they were last reported to this Panel in July.
- There is a strong corporate commitment to risk management.
- The risks on the corporate risk register, with a couple of exceptions, are being managed and mitigated sufficiently to meet their targets. The two exceptions arise through lack of budgets and demographic changes rather than insufficient management.

The Panel is asked to consider this report and appendices, and provide any comments in relation to the risks reported and actions identified.



# 1 Risk review

- 1.1 The risk registers reflect those key business risks that, if not managed appropriately, could result in the services failing to achieve one or more of their key objectives. The risks that could impact on service delivery have been taken into account in the service planning processes.
- 1.2 It is important to note that the register wording is an assessment of events that might occur. If an identified risk did materialise it would then lead to a particular impact/s resulting in a particular consequence/s. The identification of the risk does not mean the event has occurred but it shows consideration has been given to the event and that with the listed controls in place, the risk is being managed. It should not be seen as an indicator that the service has 'failed' to manage its risks.
- 1.3 The registers are live documents. They are reviewed regularly by the Risk Owners and reported to and considered by departmental management teams. With the registers being kept as live documents and reviewed regularly, they do change over time – the level of some risks will change, some risks will be removed and new ones will be added.
- 1.4 Any risks deemed to be of corporate significance or that require management at a corporate level are escalated to the Corporate Risk Register where they are monitored by the Chief Officer Group (COG). For the services that report to this Panel these are risk numbers 1 and 2 on Appendix 2 (Deterioration of economic situation, and Investments fail to be repaid).
- 1.5 The two services' registers show that most of the risks have good or improving prospects of being managed sufficiently to meet the targets (called the "aspiration risk scores"). The Corporate Finance risks on appendix 2 also contain four risks that are at their targets. These have been retained on the register as they require regular monitoring by management to ensure they remain at the desired levels.
- 1.6 Appendices 1, 2 and 4 show summarised versions of the risk registers for Chief Executives department, Corporate Finance and the corporate risk register. Those risks within the services that report to this Panel that are assessed as 'Very High' or 'High' are set out in more detail in appendix 3.
- 1.7 The only risk showing weakening prospects is CEX 2, Reduced capacity at the Corporate Centre, where the quantity of future change initiatives in the authority is likely to lead to significant pressures.

- 1.8 Overall, the risks within these two services have improved significantly since they were last reported to this Panel in July.
- The project to bring in the Modern Reward Strategy is now much more certain with union approval being given in the past month and implementation dates set.
  - The recession and rising unemployment is actually making it easier for the authority to recruit to most positions, although some specialist positions are still difficult to fill with suitable candidates. Retention rates for staff are also higher than in the past leading to fewer vacancies.
  - The significant uncertainties caused by the LGR now seem to be receding and will hopefully disappear in the next few months once the LGR position is clarified.
  - The Treasury Management function is now very high profile, closely scrutinised and while the situation with the Icelandic banks is not ideal, there is more certainty around expected outcomes.

## **2 Corporate risk register**

- 2.1 As mentioned above in 1.4 the corporate risk register contains those key risks that could impact on the achievement of County Council objectives. Most risks sit at the departmental or service level but those significant ones that are cross cutting, could directly affect key objectives or need to have corporate management are included on the corporate risk register.
- 2.2 COG reviews the corporate risk register on a quarterly basis. New risks arising, either escalated from departmental registers or new emerging risks, are considered by COG and included on the corporate register or referred back to a department where relevant.
- 2.3 The corporate risk register is reported to the Audit Committee on a quarterly basis with the last report being on 24 September 2009.
- 2.4 A summary of the corporate risk register that was reported to the Audit Committee is included at Appendix 4. This shows that all of the risks, with the exception of risks 0207 and 3389, are showing good or improving prospects of being managed and controlled sufficiently to meet their targets. These two risks, both assessed as 'Very high', relate to uncertainties over whether there is sufficient funding within Adult Social Services or commissioning partners to meet rising needs resulting from demographic changes.
- 2.5 The criteria used to determine the likelihood of a risk arising, and the impact if it did arise, are set out in Appendix 5. This is an extract from the corporate Risk Strategy. Multiplying the likelihood score (of 1 to 5) by

the impact score (of 1 to 5) gives the overall risk score and hence the risk category.

### **3 Resource implications**

- 3.1 **Finance:** There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. However, continuing improvement in the application of risk management within the services will contribute to improving the use of resources, including financial resources, across the services.

### **4 Section 17 Crime and Disorder implications**

- 4.1 While there are no direct implications, the risk management activities within Corporate Finance and other areas do contribute towards maintaining robust controls against the risk of fraud, loss of information and loss of assets.

### **5 Equalities Impact assessment**

- 5.1 This paper does not require a decision or recommendation on a strategy or policy and therefore an equality impact assessment is not considered necessary.

### **6 Conclusion**

- 6.1 There is a strong corporate commitment to risk management which is an active and embedded process within the County Council and the services that report to this Panel. The risk registers demonstrate that key strategic and operational risks are being identified and effectively managed.

### **7 Recommendation**

- 7.1 This Panel is asked to consider this report and appendices, and provide any comments in relation to the risks reported and actions identified for the continued embedding of risk management across Chief Executive's and Corporate Finance.

## **Background papers**

Report to Audit Committee - "Corporate Risk Register", plus appendices, dated 24 September 2009

## **Officer Contacts**

Paul Adams, Director of Corporate Resources and Cultural Services, 01603 222635 or email [paul.adams@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:paul.adams@norfolk.gov.uk)

Paul Brittain, Head of Finance, 01603 222400 or email [paul.brittain@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:paul.brittain@norfolk.gov.uk)



**If you need this Report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Derek Gorrod 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.**






# Chief Executives Department Risk Register Summary

CAO&S – 18 November 2009  
Appendix 1

No.	Risk Description	Risk Score	Prospects	Risk Owner
1	The risk of failure of ICT, as a result of a major incident, infrastructure failure or other breakdowns. As NCC is now very ICT dependent in the delivery of services, any prolonged failure would lead to significant disruption.	15 High ▲	Good	P. Adams
2	Failure to recognise that there needs to be sufficient capacity at the Corporate Centre as resources are switched to front line services as a result of funding constraints. Leading to key staff becoming overloaded and a failure to drive the organisation forward in key areas, such as performance management and partnership development.	12 High ▲	Weakening	P. Adams
3	Failure to successfully deliver and implement an acceptable proposal for the Modern Reward Strategy. Leads to not meeting a national agreement and employee relations issues.	10 High ▲	Good	A. Gibson
4	Financial deficits for the trading units (eg CTD, Legal Services) or loss of external income for unforeseen reasons (eg Registrars, Coroners) will lead to budget overspends and reductions in services.	9 Medium ●	Good	P. Adams
5	Failure to manage sickness absence will lead to reduced levels of productivity and raised costs in covering front-line staff	9 Medium ●	Improving	P. Adams
6	A failure to recruit and retain key staff could lead to a lack of leadership and possible deterioration of services	6 Medium ●	Good	A. Gibson
7	The Coroner's Service is demand driven and Coroners are not subject to local authority control or accountabilities in how they carry out their functions. There is the risk that the demands of the service could lead to an overspend on the allocated budget	6 Medium ●	Improving	C Walton



## Corporate Finance Risk Register Summary

CAO&S – 18 November 2009  
Appendix 2

No.	Risk Description	Risk Score	Prospects	Risk Owner
1	Protracted downturn in the UK economy leading to increases in the demand for the Council's services and adverse pressure on the Council's income. If the national and regional economic situation continues to deteriorate, this could lead to an increased likelihood of bad debts and fraud; a reduction in the number of key suppliers; and potentially, inflated prices for goods and services. It could also lead to increased demand for some services	16 Very High 	Good	P. Brittain
2	The risk that NCC investments in financial institutions fail to be fully repaid in accordance with contract terms, leading to loss of interest, loss of investments and potential damage to our reputation	15 High 	Good	P. Brittain
3	Failure to deliver services effectively while managing, delivering or supporting change programmes. Leads to either change programmes not being delivered appropriately, such as efficiency savings, support services review, etc, or adverse effects on regular service delivery	12 High 	Met target	P. Brittain
4	Failure to perform daily Treasury Management process (or part thereof) due to system failure, disaster scenario, or unavailability of relevant staff. Leads to: Liquidity Risk - inability to manage cash or insufficient cash to achieve business objectives. Credit/ Counterparty Risk - unable to perform and monitor investment transactions. Risk of financial loss - through error, or inability to invest/manage overdrafts. Impact on business reputation.	9 Medium 	Met target	N Mark
5	Risk of failure to recruit and retain key staff across the finance service. Could lead to services (including statutory services) not being delivered at an adequate level, which could impact upon the achievement of key corporate priorities.	9 Medium 	Improving	P. Brittain

## Corporate Finance Risk Register Summary

CAO&S – 18 November 2009  
Appendix 2

No.	Risk Description	Risk Score	Prospects	Risk Owner
6	Failure to prevent fraud in the Treasury Management area	5 Medium 	Met target	N Mark
7	Risk of failure to consistently manage financial resources. Effective financial management is an intrinsic element of strong and effective service management. Failures in financial management can impact on delivery of the Council's service priorities. Unplanned overspending results in the need to redirect resources and may require mid year cuts in planned services. Poor financial management also affects the Audit Commission's judgements, particularly CAA Use of Resources.	2 Low 	Met target	P. Brittain

Detailed risk updates

Risk Name & Description			
<p><b>Risk No. CEX 1</b> – The risk of failure of ICT, as a result of a major incident, infrastructure failure or other breakdowns. As NCC is now very ICT dependent in the delivery of services, any prolonged failure would lead to significant disruption.</p>			
Risk Owner	Risk Score	Aspiration Score	Prospects
Paul Adams	15 High ▲ (3x5)	10 High (2x5)	Good
Risk Progress			
<p>The ICT Security Forum meets regularly and areas of high risk are prioritised for action. Implementation of the Medium Term Plan is progressing well, incorporating actions to improve disaster recovery and business continuity. Implementation of the Support Services Review will improve resilience by bringing together skills and experience and enabling the consolidation of risk management for the whole organisation</p>			
Tasks to mitigate the risk			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement ICT Medium Term Plan</li> <li>• Improve risk management processes</li> <li>• Maintain overall ICT Risk Register</li> <li>• Maintain risk registers for all major ICT projects</li> </ul>			
Corporate Objective			
CP00A – Customer Focus			



Detailed risk updates

Risk Name & Description			
<p><b>Risk No. CEX 2</b> - Failure to recognise that there needs to be sufficient capacity at the Corporate Centre as resources are switched to front line services as a result of funding constraints. Leading to key staff becoming overloaded and a failure to drive the organisation forward in key areas, such as performance management and partnership development.</p>			
Risk Owner	Risk Score	Aspiration Score	Prospects
Paul Adams	12 High ▲ (4x3)	6 Medium (2x3)	Weakening
Risk Progress			
<p>Capacity at the Corporate Centre has been retained to date, but the quantity of change initiatives will continue to put pressure on this area.</p>			
Tasks to mitigate the risk			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate value of capacity at centre</li> <li>• Engage wider group in activities</li> <li>• Implementation of Leadership Programme</li> <li>• Prioritising work</li> </ul>			
Corporate Objective			
CP00A- Customer Focus			

Detailed risk updates

Risk Name & Description			
<p><b>Risk No. CEX 3</b> - Failure to successfully deliver and implement an acceptable proposal for the Modern Reward Strategy. Leads to not meeting a national agreement and employee relations issues.</p>			
Risk Owner	Risk Score	Aspiration Score	Prospects
Anne Gibson	10 High ▲ (2x5)	8 Medium (2x4)	Good
Risk Progress			
<p>The risks around the management of the process have been reduced. The overall package of proposals has been collectively agreed by all three unions during October 2009 and implementation of the MRS changes can now begin. The aim is to implement the changes in April 2010</p>			
Tasks to mitigate the risk			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain and regularly review a project risk log</li> <li>• Increase project resources</li> <li>• Re-prioritise HR resources</li> <li>• Rigorous project management</li> </ul>			
Corporate Objective			
CP00C- Develop and Support Workforce			

Detailed risk updates

Appendix 3

Risk Name & Description			
<p><b>Risk No. CF 1</b> - Protracted downturn in the UK economy leading to increases in the demand for the Council's services and adverse pressure on the Council's income. If the national and regional economic situation continues to deteriorate, this could lead to an increased likelihood of bad debts and fraud; a reduction in the number of key suppliers; and potentially, inflated prices for goods and services. It could also lead to increased demand for some services. This risk is also on the Corporate Risk Register as a Very High risk</p>			
Risk Owner	Risk Score	Aspiration Score	Prospects
Paul Brittain	16 Very High ▲ (4x4)	12 High (3x4)	Good
Risk Progress			
<p>Much of the risk and actions to improve the current financial position is beyond the Council's direct control; it being a role of Central Government to manage the UK economy. The UK economic downturn is expected to be protracted and the cost of supporting financial institutions and higher levels of unemployment and benefits has led to significantly increased levels of Government debt. The Government has deferred announcement of new public spending plans and local government has been informed that it will receive the previously announced (CSR07) grant settlement in 2010/11. The impact of the downturn and its consequences on the Government's finances means that for local government, the financial prospects from 2011/12 are likely to be severe. The Council has already (Cabinet, 10 August 2009) identified a savings requirement of some £140m over the three years 2010/11 to 2012/13. The most significant financial impact of the recession for Norfolk thus far has been the reduction in interest on investments due to interest rate reductions (£9m less in 2009/10 than in 2008/09). There is some evidence of the downturn affecting Council suppliers and demand for some services. Where necessary, this is reflected in the Council's monitoring arrangements and is being built into the Council's service and financial planning for future years.</p>			
Tasks to mitigate the risk			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing monitoring by Chief Officers of the impact of the downturn on service levels, prices and key suppliers</li> <li>• Ongoing monitoring of the national economic situation and actions locally by the Council to promote economic wellbeing and provide information, support and advice to local businesses and people affected by the downturn ('State of the Economy Update' – Cabinet, 13 July 2009).</li> <li>• Ongoing monitoring by Cabinet of the level of outstanding debt.</li> <li>• Refresh and relaunch of the Council's 'Anti Fraud and Corruption Strategy'</li> </ul>			
Corporate Objective			
<p>CP08 – Build vibrant, confident and cohesive communities CP00B – Value for Money</p>			

Detailed risk updates

Appendix 3

Risk Name & Description			
<p><b>Risk No. CF 2</b> –NCC investments in financial institutions fail to be fully repaid in accordance with contract terms leading to loss of interest, loss of investments and loss of reputation. This risk is also on the Corporate Risk Register as a High risk</p>			
Risk Owner	Risk Score	Aspiration Score	Prospects
Paul Brittain	15 High ▲ (3x5)	5 Medium (1x5)	Good
Risk Progress			
<p>This is a risk that will potentially impact on NCC as a whole, affecting future years' budgets and service planning/delivery. The risk applies to all of the Council's investments and at this time, particularly to the £32.5m investments at risk with three Icelandic banks which went into administration in October 2008. A claim for recovery of the investments with interest has been lodged with the respective administrators. The first 'dividend' payment of £2.1m was received in July 2009 and on the basis of current information from the administrators, the Council can expect to recover £26m of the £32.5m invested. The administration process is expected to be protracted and recovery of the sums at risk needs to be closely monitored at a corporate level. The Government has deferred the requirement for local authorities to make financial provision in their budgets for any potential loss of investment until 2010/11.</p>			
Tasks to mitigate the risk			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor money markets to ensure that investments are made in accordance with the Council's investment strategy which gives priority to security of investment</li> <li>• Ongoing consideration of the budgetary implications of any loss of investment, particularly the need to make one off provision in 2010/11 for Icelandic banks 'impairment'</li> <li>• Regular monitoring and reporting of information provided by the Icelandic banks' administrators</li> <li>• Revision to the Council's Investment Strategy to reflect the current market and associated risk (County Council, February 2009).</li> <li>• Separate consideration and approval by elected Members of the Council's Treasury Management Strategy, its ongoing monitoring and the Annual Report.</li> <li>• Regular reporting to the all party elected Member Treasury Management Panel and to Cabinet on recovery progress from the Icelandic banks and current investment activity and performance</li> </ul>			
Corporate Objective			
CP00B - Value for Money			

Detailed risk updates







Risk Name & Description			
<p><b>Risk No. CF 3</b> – Failure to deliver services effectively while managing, delivering or supporting change programmes.                      Leads to either change programmes not being delivered appropriately, such as efficiency savings, support services review, etc, or adverse effects on regular service delivery.</p>			
Risk Owner	Risk Score	Aspiration Score	Prospects
Paul Brittain	12 High ▲ (3x4)	12 High (3x4)	Met target
Risk Progress			
<p>Being kept under review by regular scrutiny of the Corporate Finance Management Team. Corporately there is a more robust approach to all project management - "Gateway 0"</p>			
Tasks to mitigate the risk			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree resource plan for all significant projects</li> <li>• Dept to contribute to major projects</li> <li>• Use formal project management guidelines</li> </ul>			
Corporate Objective			
CP00B- Value for Money			

# Corporate Risk Register Summary

(as reported to Audit Committee – 24 September 2009)

CAO&S – 18 November 2009

Appendix 4

No.	Risk Description	Risk Score	Prospect	Risk Owner
<b>0207</b>	Failure to match supply to the increased demand for Adult Social Services as a result of demographic change and lack of available budgets. Leads to an inability to meet the need for home care and residential services (in particular for the growing number of people with dementia and vulnerable people at home) through direct provision, third party provision and direct payments.	16 Very High 	<b>Uncertain</b>	H Bodmer
<b>3389</b>	The level of commissioning partners contributions to services, through the Learning Difficulties Pooled Fund and Continuing Care System, could fail to match the needs in the ASSD budget plan for 2009/10. This could expose the authority to financial risk leading to service fragmentation and ultimately an inability to provide some services.	16 Very High 	<b>Uncertain</b>	H Bodmer
<b>6561</b>	Failure to reduce delayed transfers of care in Norfolk could result in increased costs, poorer outcomes for people and a worsened performance score for Norfolk	16 Very High 	<b>Improving</b>	H Bodmer
<b>8679</b>	Protracted downturn in the UK economy leading to increases in the demand for the Council's services and adverse pressure on the Council's income. If the national and regional economic situation continues to deteriorate, this could lead to an increased likelihood of bad debts and fraud; a reduction in the number of key suppliers; and potentially, inflated prices for goods and services. It could also lead to increased demand for some services.	16 Very High 	<b>Good</b>	P Brittain
<b>NEW RISK</b>	Inability to meet Learning Difficulties savings targets through PBB exercise and unpredictable service demand leads to over/under estimating cost pressures and setting inaccurate contributions and recovery plan targets to balance the budget.	16 Very High 	<b>New Risk</b>	H Bodmer
<b>8680</b>	NCC investments in financial institutions fail to be fully repaid in accordance with contract terms leading to loss of interest, loss of investments and loss of reputation.	15 High 	<b>Good</b>	P Brittain

# Corporate Risk Register Summary

(as reported to Audit Committee – 24 September 2009)

CAO&S – 18 November 2009

Appendix 4





No.	Risk Description	Risk Score	Prospect	Risk Owner
0199	Failure to divert biodegradable municipal waste from landfill leads to the authority being unable to meet the landfill directive targets. This results in significant fines and other penalties and increased landfill costs and adverse impact on Norfolk County Council's reputation.	15 High ▲	Improving	M Jackson
0214	Increased pressure on the Council's finances arising from inflationary, demographic/demand, legislative and employer pension contributions leading to cost demands exceeding available resources from government formula grant and council tax income. This in turn could lead to reductions in service and performance, including in the Council's capital investment programme in order to balance the finances at appropriate levels of tax increase.	12 High ▲	Improving	P Brittain
0201	Failure to implement the northern distributor route (NDR). This would result in the inability to implement the remainder of the NATS strategy including pedestrian enhancements in the city centre, public transport improvements, traffic management in the suburbs, reductions in accidents and would result in an increase in congestion affecting public transport reliability. It would also result in a reduction in our capacity for economic development and negatively impact on the reputation of Norfolk County Council.	12 High ▲	Good	M Jackson
3390	Risk of influenza pandemic affecting service delivery which could lead to critical services unable to function with severely curtailed resources.	12 High ▲	Improving	R Elliott
NEW RISK	Unforeseen extreme weather event (e.g. severe flooding, storm surge, windstorms, heatwave) causes major disruption to council services and/or assets, leading to unforeseen costs and budget pressures, delayed programmes of work and disruption to communities and businesses, with the attendant reputational risk.	12 High ▲	New Risk	M Jackson

# Corporate Risk Register Summary

(as reported to Audit Committee – 24 September 2009)

CAO&S – 18 November 2009

Appendix 4

No.	Risk Description	Risk Score	Prospect	Risk Owner
<b>NEW RISK</b>	Failure to secure resources to reduce the carbon footprint of our operations in 2009/10 and beyond or to prepare adequately for the Carbon Reduction Commitment (carbon trading) could lead to steeply rising energy bills, financial penalties under CRC and poor performance on NI185 under CAA. This would have a negative impact on Council's reputation for providing value for money and community leadership on climate change.	12 High 	<b>New Risk</b>	M Jackson
<b>0215</b>	Major incident at County Hall. Risk of major disruption to services delivered from County Hall following a major incident (e.g., fire, flood, explosion or loss of power) leads to County Hall being unavailable for use, which impacts on delivery of IT and communications and how they support service delivery.	10 High 	<b>Good</b>	R Elliott
<b>0200</b>	Failure to ensure sufficient capacity within the organisation to effect changes and secure investment opportunities.	9 Medium 	<b>Met target</b>	P Adams
<b>5207</b>	Strategic and operational plans could be delayed due to uncertainty around the outcome of the current Unitary proposals. This could impact upon partnership developments and proposals for future service developments	8 Medium 	<b>Improving</b>	P Adams



## Criteria for assessing risks

Once the risks have been identified, the level of risk associated with each one needs to be assessed. This enables risks to be prioritised.

Risks should be assessed in terms of:

- Likelihood - how likely is the risk to occur?
- Impact – what would the impact be if it did occur?

Both elements are given a score between 1 and 5 using the definitions below and after taking into account any control measures already in place.

The two scores are then combined (likelihood x impact) to provide an overall risk score. This score is then plotted onto the risk matrix to indicate the risk category (low, medium, high or very high) for each risk.

### Likelihood

The following table is used to decide on likelihood.

Score	Definition
1 – Rare	The event may occur only in exceptional circumstances
2 - Unlikely	The event is not expected to occur
3 - Possible	The event might occur at some time
4 – Likely	The event will probably occur in most circumstances
5 - Almost Certain	The event is expected to occur in most circumstances

### Impact

The impact of a risk can be considered in various categories such as, financial, safety, service delivery, reputation, legal, political, environmental, etc. Indeed the impact can be one or many of these together.

The table over will assist in determining what level of impact a particular risk will present across some of these categories. The table is a guide as to the relative levels and types of impacts and is appropriate for corporate risks across the authority. Sometimes it may be necessary to scale down the impact levels for the differing categories when evaluating risks at a service or project level. This is to reflect the fact that the service or project may be a much smaller entity than the corporate body and so a similar risk arising will have a greater impact.

**CAO&S – 18 November 2009**  
**Appendix 5**

SCORE	DEFINITION
1 – Insignificant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little disruption to services</li> <li>• No injury.</li> <li>• Loss of &lt; £25,000</li> <li>• Unplanned change in service delivery due to budget overspend &lt;£100,000</li> <li>• No effect on delivering corporate objective fully</li> <li>• No damage to reputation</li> <li>• No or insignificant environmental damage</li> </ul>
2 – Minor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some disruption to services</li> <li>• Minor injury</li> <li>• Loss of £25,000 - £175,000</li> <li>• Unplanned change in service delivery due to budget overspend £100,000 - £500,000</li> <li>• Little effect on achieving corporate objective</li> <li>• Minimal damage to reputation (e.g. minimal coverage in local press)</li> <li>• Minor damage to local environment</li> </ul>
3 – Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant disruption to services.</li> <li>• Violence or threat or serious injury</li> <li>• Loss of £175,000 - £500,000</li> <li>• Unplanned change in service delivery due to budget overspend £500,000. - £1m</li> <li>• Partial failure to achieve corporate objective</li> <li>• Significant coverage in local press</li> <li>• Moderate damage to local environment</li> </ul>
4 – Major	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of services for more than 48 hours but less than 7 days</li> <li>• Extensive or multiple injuries</li> <li>• Loss of £500,000 - £1m</li> <li>• Unplanned change in service delivery due to budget overspend £1m - £3m</li> <li>• Significant impact on achieving corporate objective</li> <li>• Coverage in national press</li> <li>• Major damage to local environment</li> </ul>
5 - Extreme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of services for &gt; 7 days</li> <li>• Fatality</li> <li>• Loss of &gt; £1m</li> <li>• Unplanned change in service delivery due to budget overspend &gt;£3m</li> <li>• Non delivery of corporate Objective</li> <li>• Extensive coverage in national press and on TV</li> <li>• Significant damage to local or national environment</li> <li>• Requires resignation of Director, Chief Exec or Leader of the Council</li> </ul>

# CAO&S – 18 November 2009

## Appendix 5

Likelihood and impact are then brought together in the following matrix:

		IMPACT				
		Extreme 5	Major 4	Moderate 3	Minor 2	Insignificant 1
LIKELIHOOD	Almost Certain 5	25	20	15	10	5
	Likely 4	20	16	12	8	4
	Possible 3	15	12	9	6	3
	Unlikely 2	10	8	6	4	2
	Rare 1	5	4	3	2	1

<b>Very high</b>
<b>High</b>
<b>Medium</b>
<b>Low</b>

## **ICT Plan 2010/11**

Report by the Director of Corporate Resources and Cultural Services

### **Summary**

The council's ICT Strategy is refreshed every three years, most recently in 2008. It can be viewed at

[http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/consumption/idcplg?IdcService=SS\\_GET\\_PAGE&ssDocName=NCC048056](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/consumption/idcplg?IdcService=SS_GET_PAGE&ssDocName=NCC048056)

Each year, an ICT Plan defines a programme of work to deliver the ICT Strategy and support key service challenges. The proposed ICT Plan 2010/11 can be viewed at

[http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/consumption/idcplg?IdcService=SS\\_GET\\_PAGE&ssDocName=NCC072789](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/consumption/idcplg?IdcService=SS_GET_PAGE&ssDocName=NCC072789)

This report summarises the key aspects of that plan. Recommendations fall into the following categories:

Further exploitation of existing technologies including:

- Enhancing telephone & SMS Text Services
  - Increasing server capacity to support further information sharing
  - Refreshing our Oracle hardware platforms which are 6 years old and reaching end of life
- Total cost over five years £1.661 million

Working with local schools and colleges to support IT Diploma courses for 14 – 19 year olds and provide ICT Apprenticeships for young people.

Total cost over five years £300,000

Improving resilience and disaster recovery capabilities including:

- Improve resilience for the Customer Service Centre telephone systems
- Provide anti-virus checks for emails using the secure Government Intranet to support secure exchange of information with the rest of the public sector e.g. Health
- Provide more efficient access to secondary systems in the event of a major failure
- Provide Disaster Recovery facilities for the main Children's Services Information System "Tribal"
- Explore the potential to provide a 24 x 7 ICT Standby Service

Total cost over five years £540,000

New projects that support services, including

- Health & Safety Information System
- Community Equipment Stores Information System
- Support for managing Freedom of Information (FOI) Requests
- Adding the Connexions Service to the corporate data network
- On-line Planning Application system

Total cost over five years £384,000

The panel is asked to comment on the 2010/11 ICT Plan and the basis of funding before the report is presented to Cabinet.

---

## 1. Background

- 1.1 This report describes key elements of the proposed ICT Plan 2010/11, including
- Position statement on delivery of the ICT Support Services Review
  - Position statement on delivery against the ICT Plan 2009/10
  - Proposals for ICT initiatives during 2010/11
  - The status of the council's ICT in relation to environmental impact

## 2. Proposed ICT Plan 2010/11

- 2.1 Position statement on delivery of the ICT Support Services Review

This review has involved redesigning the way in which ICT Services are delivered. The Business Case approved by Programme Board in November 2008 identified required outcomes' (in italics). Changes and their expected benefits are described for each outcome.

*Support services that can provide even better support for people working in 'the frontline'*

- Bringing together all ICT functions into one team will allow support to be provided faster and more effectively
- Service Levels for routine desktop, network and server support will decrease from the current 2 days to one hour for a wide range of user problems/requests.
- Implementing new technologies which enable ICT support to be provided to users remotely has enabled Server and Desktop resources to be reduced by 20%

*Support services that are more resilient to enable us to cope better with periods of great pressure*

- A single approach to resource allocation & management, with a single pool of resource to draw upon
- The model can also be expanded to support Shared Services.

*Support services that are more flexible so that we can respond more quickly when necessary and meet fluctuations in demands*

- A single structure allows a consistent approach to things currently dealt with at a departmental level, for instance office moves

*Better information and reporting that can support decision-making in services across the authority*

- Implementing new issue tracking and handling software for the whole ICT Service will provide full and detailed management information from all areas for the first time. This will underpin the drive for future efficiencies

*Improved value for money*

- Reduced duplication of effort, with a net post reduction of 9.98 FTEs and cost saving of £200,000 pa from 2010/11. Once all staff and services are together further opportunities for savings will be actively pursued
- The introduction of three Portfolio Leads will provide capacity in services to actively pursue change projects that use ICT to deliver efficiencies and service improvements.
- £355,000 will transfer to the Corporate Programme Office (CPO). This includes four Project Management staff and associated budget of £220,000 and the

elimination of two further ICT posts to allow an additional cash budget transfer to the CPO of £135,000 pa.

*Better career opportunities for staff.*

- Clear development paths allow the authority to develop staff in house, within a career structure, reducing the need to bring in expensive external resource
- An integrated approach to Resource Management across the ICT Services will effectively match staff skills and development needs against business needs

## 2.2 Position statement on delivery against the ICT Plan 2009/10

The programme of over 50 individual projects is delivering against plan. Quarterly Highlight Reports describe progress and are issued to the Cabinet Member for Corporate and Commercial Services. The most recent quarterly Highlight Report can be viewed at

[http://intranet.norfolk.gov.uk/cex/ICT/Strategy/ICT%20Plan\\_Quarterly\\_Highlight\\_Report.doc](http://intranet.norfolk.gov.uk/cex/ICT/Strategy/ICT%20Plan_Quarterly_Highlight_Report.doc)

The following table describes the projects budget outturn:

<b>Planned costs 2009/10</b>	<b>Forecast outturn 2009/10</b>	<b>Planned 5 year costs</b>	<b>Forecast 5 Year outturn</b>
£1,278,000	£1,024,895	£2,710,000	£2,329,895

The following table summaries planned versus actual savings:

<b>Planned Savings 2009/10</b>	<b>Actual Savings 2009/10</b>
£2,360,000	£2,234,000

The £126,000 shortfall in predicted versus actual savings in 2009/10 is due to the delay in the implementation of the Printer Rationalisation Project.

## 2.3 Proposals for ICT initiatives during 2010/11

The proposed projects in the ICT Plan 2010/11 fall into four categories:

- Further exploitation of existing investment
- Skills
- Resilience & Disaster Recovery
- New Projects that support frontline services

Costs are provided in the Summary of this document, with a brief description of the proposed projects shown below:

### 2.3.1. Further exploitation of existing investment

Describes groups of our existing technologies and how they can support business need. It also recommends increased capacity in some areas:

- ICT to help us stay in touch, this includes telephone and SMS text services
- Sharing information, includes shared server environments, the Internet & Intranet, Electronic Document & Records Management System, major Information Systems including FIMS, IHRIS & CareFirst, Microsoft tools and Geographical Information Systems

- 
- Flexible Working, including laptops, secure remote access, use of personal ICT equipment & home broadband, mobile phones / Blackberry and wireless

Services have identified the following lists of projects as either having already used or will deploy these technologies:

- Adult Social Services Transformation Programme, including Enhanced Access Service and Assessment and Care Management Review
- Corporate Communications Team use Twitter and “You Tube” and used “Face Book” for online petitions as part of the successful campaign to dual the A11
- Corporate Office Accommodation Strategy
- Cultural Services Flexible Working
- Customer Services to create a streamlined front door for NCC customers via the website, telephone and email contact centre, and face-to-face locations
- Electronic Criminal Records Bureau process checks
- HR Self Service
- Learning Disabilities Priority Based Budgeting (PBB) Project
- Legal Services, integration of case management files with the authorities Electronic Document & Records Management System
- Library users Self-Service
- Norfolk Audit Services – Flexible Working
- Registrar’s initiative “Tell Me Once” project, including providing on-line public access to birth, marriage and death certificates
- P&T, a new service to provide access for members and Quality Parish Councils to raise and track service requests for Highways issues
- Priory House
- Public wireless access in libraries
- Trading Standards Mobile Working
- Single Post Service for County Hall

### 2.3.2. Skills

The council can provide support for the provision of Information Technology (IT) Diploma courses in our schools by:

- Providing workshops to support IT teachers via the Professional Developments Placement Service
- Providing workshops for students
- Providing three IT apprenticeships a year for 16 – 19 year olds

### 2.3.3. Resilience and Disaster Recovery

Recommendations to improve ICT resilience including:

- Changes to our ICT infrastructure to improve resilience
- Potential introduction of a limited 24 x 7 out-of-hours ICT Standby Service

### 2.3.4. New projects that support frontline services

There are six recommended projects

- Health & Safety Information System
- Equipment Service Information System
- Managing FOI requests
- Adding the Connexions Service to the council’s data network
- Corporate Management Information
- Planning Application System

---

## 2.4 The status of the council's ICT in relation to environmental impact

ICT accounts for 2% of all global CO2 emissions. The Cabinet Office has created the "Greening Government ICT Strategy". The strategy highlights a range of potential improvements that public sector organisations should consider. Based on these priorities the following progress has been made:

### 2.4.1. Extend the lifecycle of all ICT

The ICT Technical Architecture Strategy (TAS) details the technologies that can be used within NCC. It now includes an assessment of the energy efficiency of equipment and services and energy efficiency criteria in the selection process for new ICT equipment and services. Equipment is not replaced until it reaches "end of life".

### 2.4.2. PC and laptops

The Desktop Refresh Project replaced the council's PCs and laptops with new energy efficient versions and enabled an overall reduction in the number of units by setting policy which only provided one device per user. When the project began the Audit Commission recommended that desktops were refreshed every three years, it is likely that the next refresh will take place later than this, at four or five years. Future recommendations will be made to members based on the ability of equipment to support business needs along side affordability and environment considerations, it is anticipated that a minimum extension of the useable life of desktops from three to four years will create a one-off saving of £450,000 in 2012/13.

Each new machine provides a CO2 emission reduction of 0.30 tons pa which is equivalent of 620 miles by car compared to the previous model.

### 2.4.3. Device power management

We are currently reviewing different approaches to ensuring that all user ICT equipment is powered off over night.

### 2.4.4. Printers

Energy efficiency is one of the key criteria for recommendations for the new Corporate Printing Strategy and Printer Rationalisation Project, key requirements include:

- An infrastructure operating with default print settings of double-sided, black and white;
- A target user-device ratio of 12:1 overall across the Authority;
- No costly inkjet devices to be retained or procured;
- A reduction in the number of personal printers in use;
- Implementation of 'secure printing' to eliminate confidentiality concerns;
- All devices to be networked;
- Automatic re-direction of larger or more complex printing to a Central Print Room; and
- Improved job accounting and device monitoring



---

#### 2.4.5. Data Centres

The County Hall Data Centre houses the core NCC ICT infrastructure (servers, network switches etc)

Data Centre Infrastructure Efficiency (DCiE) and Power Usage Effectiveness (PUE) ratings have been developed by the 'Green Grid' and are currently being adopted by the European Commission as part of their Data Centre energy efficiency code of conduct.

A DCiE score of 50% and PUE score of 2 is an average score for existing Data Centre facilities. NCC Data Centre has been independently assessed against DCiE and PUE by Keysource (external assessors), results were:

DCiE score 53.36%

PUE score 1.88

### 3. Resource Implications

#### 3.1 Finance:

As with the last four annual ICT plans, the 2010/11 ICT Plan is proposed on the basis of funding from within existing budget provision.

##### 3.1.1. Costs

Costs in 2010/11 have been identified as £1.135 million, with 5-year costs of £2.885 million. All costs and funding are included for 5 years

##### 3.1.2. Savings

Total savings for 2010/11 are predicted as £3,933,000. Members have already allocated savings to specific projects. The following table demonstrates the investments which members have previously approved that are funded from these savings.

<b>Saving Item</b>	<b>Saving £</b>	<b>Investment Item</b>	<b>Cost £</b>
Mainframe decommissioning	£700,000	Desktop Refresh	£1,584,000
Telephone call charge reduction	£240,000	Electronic document & Records Management system	£276,000
Data & Voice re-let	£1,743,000	Library Self Service RFID	£199,000
Printer Rationalisation	£200,000	Improved Web Services	£208,000
		Proposed 2010/11 ICT Plan contribution from savings	£199,000
ICT staff cost reduction from ICT Support Services Review	£550,000	ICT contribution to the new Corporate Programme Office	£355,000
		ICT saving identified within CEX budget	£200,000
Removal of allocation for Customer Relationship Management	£500,000	Provision to meet potential ICT costs from Norfolk Forward, including expansion of EDRMS implementation	£500,000
		Meeting 2% inflation on non staff costs as no inflation added to these budgets	£179,000
	<b>£3,933,000</b>		<b>£3,700,000</b>
		Unallocated	£233,000

---

### 3.2 **Staff:**

The ICT Support Services Review has reduced ICT full time equivalent posts (FTE) by 15.98 FTEs from a current total of 165.24 FTEs. Representing a 9.5% overall reduction in FTEs.

Having implemented the ICT Support Service Review Target Operating Model, ICT staff will actively work to drive further efficiencies within the ICT Service during 2010/11.

### 3.3 **Property:**

We will seek to bring dispersed ICT staff together into a single location. This is seen as particularly important to assist in building a single ICT Team but is expected to happen incrementally.

### 3.4 **IT:**

Main focus for recommendations

## 4. **Other Implications**

4.1 **Legal Implications:** Standard Office of Government Commerce Framework contracts or ESPO procurement routes will be used where required.

4.2 **Human Rights:** None

4.3 **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA):** The ICT Plan describes a range of activities that will take place during 2010/11. Equality Impact Assessment has taken place where appropriate.

4.4 **Communications:** The ICT Plan will be communicated via existing ICT governance and communication arrangements.

4.5 **Health and Safety Implications:** There are no direct Health & Safety implications, however the proposed ICT Plan 2010/11 includes the implementation of an Information System to support the Health & Safety function within the council.

## 5. **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

5.1 No implications.

---

## 6. Risk Implications/Assessment

- 6.1 The ICT Plan contains proposals which seek to provide mitigation against risks identified in the Corporate ICT Risk Register which can be viewed at [http://intranet.norfolk.gov.uk/cex/ICT/Strategy/Corporate\\_ICT\\_Risk\\_Register.pdf](http://intranet.norfolk.gov.uk/cex/ICT/Strategy/Corporate_ICT_Risk_Register.pdf)

Specifically the items listed in the above Summary titled "Improving resilience and disaster recovery capabilities".

- 6.2 Failure to address these risks could cause ICT failures that would directly affect public access to council services, for instance the failure of the phone system within the Customer Service Centre.
- 6.3 The proposals would mitigate these risks within specific IT infrastructure

## 7. Overview & Scrutiny Panel Comments

- 7.1 To complete following panel

## 8. Alternative Options

- 8.1 Where appropriate alternative options have been considered in the development of individual projects within the proposed ICT Plan.

## 9. Conclusion

- 9.1 The proposed ICT Plan offers a series of projects that build on previous investment and continue to build a sustainable, affordable ICT infrastructure to support service needs.

## 10. Action Required

- 10.1 Action Required - Corporate Affairs Overview & Scrutiny Review Panel are asked to comment on the ICT Plan 2010/11 and the basis of funding before the report is presented to Cabinet.

## Background Papers

ICT Strategy  
ICT Plan 2009/10  
Proposed ICT Plan 2010/11  
ICT Highlight Report  
ICT Risk Register

---

## Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Officer Name: Paul Adams      Tel No; 01603 222609  
email address paul.adams@norfolk.gov.uk

Officer Name: Karen O'Kane      Tel No; 01603 222100  
email address: karen'okane@Norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this Agenda in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Karen O'Kane 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.