



## One Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Thursday 21 March 2013 at 7.30 pm**

Committee Room 4, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane,  
Wembley, HA9 9HD

### Membership:

#### Members

Councillors:

Ashraf (Chair)  
Colwill (Vice-Chair)  
Chohan  
Lorber  
McLennan  
Mitchell Murray  
Pavey  
Ketan Sheth

#### first alternates

Councillors:

Brown  
BM Patel  
Hossain  
Brown  
Harrison  
Denselow  
Van Kalwala  
Kabir

#### second alternates

Councillors:

Beck  
Kansagra  
Allie  
Hopkins  
Hector  
Gladbaum  
Mashari  
Allie

**For further information contact:** Toby Howes, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
020 8937 1307, [toby.howes@brent.gov.uk](mailto:toby.howes@brent.gov.uk)

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:

**[www.brent.gov.uk/committees](http://www.brent.gov.uk/committees)**

**The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting**

# Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

| Item   | Page   |
|--|--------|
| <b>1    Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests</b>   |        |
| Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting any relevant financial or other interest in the items on the agenda.   |        |
| <b>2    Deputations (if any)</b>   |        |
| <b>3    Minutes of the last meeting held on 6 February 2013</b>  | 1 - 8  |
| The minutes are attached.  |        |
| <b>4    Matters arising</b>  |        |
| <b>5    Managing the Public Realm</b>  |        |
| Members will receive a presentation providing an update on the project. This will include:-  |        |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Objectives and scope of the contract</li><li>• Procurement process</li><li>• The timetable</li><li>• Progress to date</li></ul>  |        |
| <b>6    Re-procurement of the new parking contract</b>   | 9 - 22 |
| Members will receive a presentation providing an update on the re-procurement of the parking enforcement project. The presentation will cover:   |        |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The existing contract and incumbent provider</li><li>• Procurement approach</li><li>• Tender submissions and outcome</li><li>• BAFO negotiation and submissions</li><li>• Financial outcome and savings</li><li>• Operational outcome</li><li>• Added value</li><li>• Collaborative outcome</li><li>• Mobilisation outcome</li></ul> |        |

The full report went to the Executive on 11 March 2013 to award a joint contract for the provision of parking services as required by Standing Order 88(c). The report summarised the results of the procurement process undertaken by officers from the West London Alliance participating boroughs for the provision of parking enforcement and notice processing services and following completion of the evaluation recommends a contractor for award of the proposed contract. The report also sets out the financial savings and other benefits associated with the contract. The Executive report has been provided as background information.

**7 Performance and Finance Review, Quarter 3, 2012-13** 23 - 62

The report provides details of the council's performance and financial situation for quarter three of 2012-13.

**8 One Council Overview and Scrutiny work programme** 63 - 68

The work programme is attached.

**9 Date of next meeting**

The next meeting of the One Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be confirmed at the Annual Council meeting on 15 May 2013.

**10 Any other urgent business**

Notice of items raised under this heading must be given in writing to the Democratic Services Manager or his representative before the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 64.



Please remember to ***SWITCH OFF*** your mobile phone during the meeting.

- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public.
- Toilets are available on the second floor.
- Catering facilities can be found on the first floor near the Paul Daisley Hall.
- A public telephone is located in the foyer on the ground floor, opposite the Porters' Lodge

This page is intentionally left blank



## **MINUTES OF THE ONE COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE Wednesday 6 February 2013 at 7.30 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Ashraf (Chair), Councillor Colwill (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Chohan, McLennan, Mitchell Murray and Pavey

Also present: Councillor H B Patel.

Apologies for absence were received from: Councillors Lorber and Ketan Sheth

### **1. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

None declared.

### **2. Minutes of the last meeting held on 5 December 2012**

RESOLVED:-

That the minutes of the last meeting held on 5 December 2012 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

### **3. Matters arising**

*Complaints annual report*

Priya Mistry (Policy and Performance Officer, Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement) agreed to re-circulate information to Councillor Colwill that provided an explanation as to why compensation for adult and social care related complaints had increased despite the number of escalated complaints falling.

### **4. Procurement project**

Fiona Ledden (Director of Legal and Procurement) provided an update to the committee on the procurement project that had been running since 2012, following the strategic procurement transformation that had changed the composition of staff from mainly temporary staff to permanent council staff, with a number of professional category managers embedded within service directorates. Fiona Ledden advised that the category managers were working actively with the service directorates in ensuring the council benefitted from procurement activities. Turning to the areas covered by the procurement project, she reported that the e-procurement strand had been largely successful and was at green RAG status. Under this strand, i-proc, part of the Oracle module, was being developed and this would facilitate compliance and ensure that staff were accessing the specific contract they were involved in.

Fiona Ledden stated that considerable efforts had been made to provide the appropriate training in up-skilling staff to undertake procurement activities to a high

standard. The Business Manager in Legal and Procurement had undertaken a training needs analysis across the council to facilitate this and training courses were being rolled out, with two scheduled for February and March 2013. It was noted that the training strand was presently at amber. The project also had an additional savings strand with a target saving of £1.5m per annum and this was the most challenging one to achieve, although this had recently moved from red to amber status. The reasons for it being problematic was that it involved finding savings from what was mainly the day to day work of the team and there was also no dedicated project manager to undertake this. However, the resource undertaking e-procurement development had been identified to dedicate some time in project managing this strand and a clear plan of activity was now in place.

Members then discussed this item and raised some questions with regard to the project. It was commented that the previous lack of resources for the project had been addressed and further information was sought in respect of the work of the project manager and what training was being offered as some staff could potentially be inexperienced in procurement and was this available to new staff. The importance of up-skilling staff to reduce reliance on external staff and consultants was emphasised and details of what progress had been made in respect of procurement was sought, whilst an enquiry about the progress of controlling maverick spend was made. Members asked how the savings target had been identified and was the emphasis on improving the service as well as making savings. It was suggested that if there was a specific model as to how procurement was to operate, then it should be set out clearly and also pay due consideration to the Brent economy. It was also asked whether a preferred suppliers list for contracts and services was available and could a link to the council's contracts database be provided.

In reply, Fiona Ledden advised that project management was a key issue and much consideration had been given into identifying the right support and data analysts had refocused their efforts on this. The Business Manager had been tasked with the role of setting up a training programme and those who had undertaken initial online courses could then go straight onto intermediate level courses rather than basic courses. The rolling training programme also provided networking opportunities and was available to all new staff too. Fiona Ledden advised that the large majority of Procurement staff were permanent, despite the difficulties in recruiting permanent appropriately skilled staff. However, there had been specific procurement activities that required specialist input and three interim staff had been appointed to assist. Fiona Ledden emphasised that up-skilling staff across the council was both desirable and necessary and a key objective was to raise the levels of professionalism and standards in procurement. She advised the committee that councils were obliged to consider local interests under the Public Services (Social Value Act) 2012 and this covered procurement issues, although the main objective was in obtaining the best possible price and value for money and to be as efficient as possible. Where feasible, the council also worked with other local authorities in order to help achieve this. Fiona Ledden added that every effort was being made at being creative and innovative in order to generate savings. In respect of maverick spend, she advised that work on this was on-going, although this depended on putting in place improved coding. Procurement was also working with Oracle to ensure the right procedures were followed. Fiona Ledden advised that providing a preferred suppliers list could be difficult to determine and efforts were being made to reduce the number of suppliers and avoid duplication.

Peter Stachniewski (Head of One Council Programme) advised Members that there had initially been a procurement project savings target of £1.5m and this had been part of financial planning for both 2013-14 and 2014-15. However, the target was reassessed as more knowledge was gained as to the savings that were actually to be delivered and which could therefore be included in the budget. Members heard that savings were a key driver but that procurement was only one element within most One Council projects with improvements to service also being a key driver.

The Chair then requested that the committee be provided with a list of regular suppliers and what steps were being taken to reduce the number of these.

## **5. Project Athena**

Denis Turner (Project Manager, One Council Programme) introduced the report and explained that the current payroll system was based on Logica which was coming to the end of being supported, whilst support for the Oracle Release (R)11 Finance and Procurement modules were similarly due to end this year. Project Athena offered both payroll services and Oracle R12 and the plan was that these services be provided through a partnership with five other London boroughs – Havering, Croydon, Lambeth, Lewisham and Barking and Dagenham - on a shared single platform. Working with these partners, a rigorous approach to procurement had been undertaken to ensure the appropriate technical specification was set out to potential bidders. Denis Turner drew the committee's attention to the IT specification as set out in the report and advised that all partners had agreed to keep as closely to the specification as possible in order to keep costs down.

Turning to the project's progress, Denis Turner advised that the solutions validation stage was near to completion and user acceptance testing would soon commence and this would be followed by payroll parallel tests. The aim was for the system to go live on 1 August 2013, although he cautioned that there may be some difficulties in achieving this. Once implemented, the new system would mean significant changes for managers in that they would be taking more day to day responsibilities for controlling expenditure and also HR matters, such as staff absences and sickness. Denis Turner felt that it was important to embed the systems initially before looking at ways to best harness the benefits it can bring.

During discussion by Members, it was queried whether there was any risk of data manipulation and did Oracle R12 offer more functionality. It was enquired whether it was possible for staff to enter data erroneously. A member concurred that it was important to ensure the system was working properly before fully exploiting its benefits. The committee sought further details with regard to training for managers including what numbers were involved and whether this would take place before Project Athena was rolled out. A member asked if there were any savings objectives involved in the project and if so would there be any initial savings and why had details of savings not been outlined in the report. It was also queried if there were any concerns that such savings could be achieved. Details of implementation and service costs were sought and how long would it take for the savings to recover these costs. The committee asked whether savings, including cost comparisons with the current system could be provided. It was commented that it would be beneficial to identify what services could be shared in order to save costs and to see evidence of how the project was progressing. Members also

asked how the project was linked with other projects and would the project's implementation result in further staff restructuring.

In reply, Denis Turner advised that there was no risk of data manipulation as each partner borough had a separate database and there had been discussions with security advisers to ensure the system was secure. Oracle R12 offered more functionality and was already in use at two of the partner boroughs, including the host borough, Havering, who were looking at more creative ways of using it. R12 was quite simple to use and similar to R11 and Cap Gemini were running training sessions that would be cascaded to other staff. It had been identified that around 350 to 400 staff would require training, ranging from core users to less frequent users. It was intended to supplement training with online training support resources, such as video captures, and also in other ways such as drop-ins and floor walks. Core users would be trained before Project Athena was fully implemented. Denis Turner explained that the system would pick up data errors and that it was difficult to accidentally input the wrong data. He felt that the benefits of the system would become apparent. He also stressed that it was important that there was sufficient training and support from staff to ensure the system to operate properly initially, before seeing what other changes the project could enable.

Peter Stachniewski advised that there was not a specific savings target for the project yet, however it would deliver savings in the longer term. The original business case for the project had indicated that an organisation of Brent's size would typically deliver savings of around £1m per annum but the specific areas the savings would be made from could not be identified until after the project's implementation. Peter Stachniewski advised that Cap Gemini implementation costs were around £1.2m and their on-going annual charges were in the region of £300k. He said that these costs had to be incurred to replace the existing Logica payroll and Oracle R11 systems because the existing systems were no longer supported. Peter Stachniewski explained that the broad overall costs of the new system compared to the existing system could be provided, but this would not cover savings details.

Members noted that data storage could easily be expanded and in addition there would be an up to date back-up file. Members also noted that the contract with Cap Gemini was for four years.

The Chair requested that details of the costs of the new system be provided and also for information to be obtained from the five other London borough partners on the savings assumptions they had made.

## **6. Realigning Corporate and Business Support Project**

Frank Dick (Project Manager – Realignment of Corporate and Business Support) introduced the report and advised that the project was close to being fully implemented. The project was needed to obtain necessary savings, however it was recognised that there were savings elements in other projects too and there would be implications at a later stage as a result of the implementation of Project Athena. The other main driver was the requirement to make staff structural changes due to the move to the Civic Centre, with the intention of drawing business and administrative support services together. The project would enable services to be rationalised and improved and provide a single business support model and £1m



savings for 2014/15 would be made, with part year savings in 2013/14. The new model had been devised following a look at how other London boroughs and local authorities delivered their business and administrative support functions. The committee heard that the number of business and administrative support managers had been reduced, however the changes also offered a more defined career structure for those working in these areas. This would help raise the professionalism of the service and this was reflected by the fact that non-managerial business support posts were graded from SO6 and upwards. Frank Dick advised that there may be up to 34 redundancies as a result of the changes, with around two thirds of these being from voluntary redundancies, however this was still subject to the final redeployment process.

Frank Dick advised that the business support structure would be fully staffed from around the middle of April 2013. The changes made would provide tangible benefits to front line staff and service delivery and an Improvement Plan would be set in place. For some services, a paper light approach would be appropriate, although it was acknowledged that other services would still require a larger element of paperwork. However, there was greater potential to make use of more technology in order to accommodate the reduction in staff. Turning to specialist support functions covering areas such as IT, legal and HR, Frank Dick advised that a further £1m savings would be made for 2013/14. Some posts were being removed, however these were largely vacant posts and all staff were expected to be in post by March 2013.

Members then raised some issues on this item and it was asked what the redundancy costs would amount to. It was queried whether the 34 overall reduction in posts all equated to redundancies and would new posts be created or realigned. It was also asked whether pension costs had been factored in and had voluntary redundancy been offered. Furthermore, an explanation as to why any external recruitment would be undertaken was sought as it was suggested that internal staff could be redeployed to prevent the risk of losing talented officers. A member asked if internal staff that had been retained were appropriately skilled and were the savings figures and level of services comparable with other local authorities. Another member commented that decentralising services could actually be beneficial as it would help the council remain more in touch with the community and clarification was sought with regard to whether staff would be re-assigned where there was extra demand. Further information was also requested in respect of staffing in Children's Centres and if staff were absent at a particular locality, would staff from another locality be redeployed to it. The committee sought confirmation as to whether business support would function as paper light or paper free as it was felt that it would not be possible to operate with a total absence of paper. The total number of staff moving to the Civic Centre and who would monitor the effectiveness of the new structure was also queried.

In response, Frank Dick advised that the reduction in posts involved a number of managerial positions, although this was also being undertaken across all grades. The percentage of savings for other local authorities averaged around 20-25%, whilst the council's was around 16-17%, although it was felt that this was a prudent level of savings and there were likely to be further changes once the service had bedded in within the Civic Centre. The committee noted that post reductions did not necessarily equate to the same number of redundancies, which were offered where deemed appropriate. Frank Dick explained that the job descriptions of

Business and Corporate Support posts had changed as well as the basis of the grading, whilst a new post of Executive Business Manager located in the Chief Executive's office had also been created. A number of the posts were now significantly different to their previous roles and required greater flexibility and all staff had undertaken a rigorous selection process to obtain their current posts. However, these services were still largely staffed by those who had been appointed internally and it was confirmed that voluntary redundancies had been made available for application. Frank Dick stated that some support staff would remain at Children's Centres and the level of support would be determined by locality following discussions on arrangements. He acknowledged that paperwork was unlikely to ever be eliminated entirely and Business and Corporate Support staff continued to take a number of telephone calls and undertake signposting activities. The committee noted that the changes to support services would be regularly reviewed and a report was likely to be put to this committee around March/April 2014.

Peter Stachniewski advised that redundancy costs from the exercise had yet to be confirmed, however there had been provision for this in the business case which had taken into account redundancy and pension payments. In addition, it was noted that redundancies represented a one-off cost. However, the savings would be recurring and so offer longer term financial benefits and it had been acknowledged that the council needed to downsize in view of the fiscal pressures it faced.

Joanna Swinton-Bland (Head of Integrated Business Support) emphasised that a key objective was to upskill existing staff and to keep them within the organisation and provide them with all the opportunities they needed. Standards were also being raised and a number of training resources were available, such as online training, IT skills and statement writing skills. The assessments determined whether staff had the appropriate skills and staff had commented that this was a fair and equitable assessment during feedback. Joanna Swinton-Bland explained that where there was excessive demand, it was likely that staff from the Civic Centre would be deployed to the locality concerned. She advised that the emphasis was to operate a paper light, as opposed to a paper free, service and opportunities to avoid using paper where possible were being looked at.

#### **7. Performance and Finance Review, Quarter 2, 2012-13**

At the Chair's suggestion, it was agreed that this item be deferred to the next meeting where results of quarter 3 of 2012-13 could also be discussed. The Children and Families overspend mentioned in the report would also be discussed following a request from Councillor Pavey.

#### **8. One Council Overview and Scrutiny work programme**

Members had before them the committee's work programme. It was noted that procurement of parking enforcement was to be scheduled for a future meeting. The Chair also requested that the review of the library transformation project be added to the work programme.

9. **Date of next meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the One Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee was scheduled for Thursday, 21 March 2013 at 7.30 pm.

10. **Any other urgent business**

None.

The meeting closed at 9.45 pm

J Ashraf  
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

|   |  |
|---|--|
|    | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Executive</b><br/>11 March 2013</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Report from the Director of Environment and Neighbourhood Services</b></p> |
| For Action  | Wards Affected: ALL  |
| <p><b>Approval to Award Contract for Parking Services – Collaborative Cross Borough Procurement of Parking Services</b></p> |  |

Appendix 1 is not for publication in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12(A) (3).

The Council has received representations from the Partner Authority to the proposed joint contract that requires the identity of the recommended bidder for award of contract to be classified as exempt by virtue of Schedule 12A, paragraph 4 of the Local Government Act 1972. However the partner authorities including Brent Council intend to issue a joint press announcement naming the successful bidder on or after the 21<sup>st</sup> March 2013.

## 1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report seeks the approval of the Executive to award a joint contract for the provision of parking services as required by Standing Order 88(c). This report summarises the results of the procurement process undertaken by officers from the WLA participating boroughs for the provision of parking enforcement and notice processing services and following completion of the evaluation recommends a contractor for award of the proposed contract. The report also sets out the financial savings and other benefits associated with the contract.

## 2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Executive approve the award of the joint contract for parking services to Bidder 3 for an initial contract period of five (5) years with the option to extend for a further period of five (5) years.
- 2.2 That the Executive note that the value of the Brent specific elements of the contract for the provision of parking services is estimated to be circa £19.3 million over the five year duration of the contract.
- 2.3 That the Executive note that the new parking contract offers a saving of £3.5m over 5 years, compared to the existing contract.
- 2.4 That the Executive delegate to the Director of Environment & Neighbourhood Services, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Procurement, authority to conclude and sign on the Council's behalf the Inter Authority Agreement discussed in

paragraph 3.2.3 and paragraphs 8.6 and 8.7

- 2.5 That the Executive note the risks identified in Section 5 and the proposed approach to mitigation

### **3.0 Detail**

#### **3.1 Overview**

- 3.1.1 An update on the Cross Borough Parking collaboration was reported at the Executive in September 2012. This report now provides the outcome of the collaborative procurement and the resulting recommendation for award of contract.

#### **3.2 Governance**

- 3.2.1 Members will be aware from the pre-tender report of 16 July 2012 that the Council acted as lead authority for the procurement process providing specialist procurement and legal advice. Hounslow council provided HR and Employment advice, with assistance from the WLA for the purpose of procuring the joint parking services. Specialist financial advice relating to the procurement process was provided by Alpha Parking Limited following a competitive procurement process.
- 3.2.2 The Council, Ealing and Hounslow boroughs have determined that the proposed parking services contract will be a joint contract, executed by all three authorities, as opposed to a framework agreement. This approach has been drafted to allow for each borough's administration to have sovereignty over its strategic decisions for its parking service, while achieving economies of scale.
- 3.2.3 Each partner borough, including Brent council will enter into an Inter Authority Agreement, which will set out the mechanism for monitoring the joint contract and the contractor's performance, in addition to ensuring continuous improvements in the effective delivery of the services. The Inter Authority Agreement will contain provision with respect to costs apportionment for each borough in relation to the services it receives from the recommended contractor.

#### **3.3 Procurement Process**

- 3.3.1 Parking services are defined as Part B services under the Public Contract Regulations 2006 (as amended) ("the Regulations") however the provision of ICT software, which accounts for only a small percentage of the total estimated cost, is Part A. The value of the part B element outweighs the value attributable to the Part A element, and the proposed joint contract was treated as a Part B service for the purpose of the Regulations, on the basis of aggregation.
- 3.3.2 As a Part B service, there was a two-stage approach; Pre Qualification followed by Invitation to Tender (ITT) for selected providers but with an additional Best And Final Offers (BAFO) stage. The BAFO stage asked the top scoring providers to review their initial proposals and re-engineer specific elements in order to drive through the most economical offer to the collaboration.
- 3.3.3 In order to meet the Council's Contract Standing Orders, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (EU Treaty Principles) and achieve best value; the Council carried out a competitive tender process in an open, fair and transparent manner with full advertising of the requirements in the Official Journal of the European Union ("OJEU") and compliance when inviting and evaluating tenders to

ensure Value for Money for the Council in the delivery of the Parking Services Contract.

#### **4.0 The Tender Process and Council's Contract Standing Orders** Evaluation Process

##### **4.1 Stage One - Pre-Qualifying Stage**

4.1.1 On 16 August 2012 a voluntary contract notice was placed in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) to seek expressions of interest. The notice specified the Council's requirement to procure providers of Parking Services for three Councils.

4.1.2 Seven organisations expressed an interest in tendering. A Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) was issued to all the organisations that expressed an interest for return by 24 September 2012.

4.1.3. The PQQ's were evaluated on the ability to meet the following criteria:

- Financial standing and evaluation of last set of audited accounts;
- Health & Safety, Quality Assurance;
- Technical capacity including environmental and sustainability requirements; and
- Business Continuity to undertake the contract for the Council.

4.1.4. Six organisations submitted completed PQQ's. These were evaluated resulting in one organisation being eliminated from the process due to poor Health and Safety responses. Five organisations met the criteria set out in paragraph 4.3 above and were shortlisted and invited to tender.

##### **4.2 Stage Two - Invitation to Tender**

4.2.1 Invitation to Tender documents were sent to the five shortlisted organisations on 15<sup>th</sup> October with a return by date of 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2012 extended to the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2012 due to the clarification deadline being extended, in order to provide bidders with more time to review the Council's clarification responses and accordingly price their bids prior to submission.

4.2.2 One organisation chose to withdraw without submitting an ITT bid, citing lack of local resources as a new entrant to the UK market. The delegated representative of the Head of Corporate Procurement opened the four tenders received with a representative from Democratic Service Area on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2012, in accordance with Contract Standing Orders ("CSO").

4.2.3 The Tender documents that were issued to the bidders outlined the following evaluation process and criteria to identify the "most economically advantageous tender" in accordance with CSO requirements and EU Procurement Regulations

##### **High level Criteria:**

| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Percentage of Total Score</b> |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Price, including systems and working methods as proposed in the method statement | 65%                              |
| Quality of the proposals   | 35%                              |

4.2.4 The Quality sub-criteria communicated to tenderers, which the Council used to determine that a Tender is the most economically advantageous, are listed in Table 1 below:

| <b>Rating</b> | <b>Table 1<br/>Evaluation Criteria for Method Statement</b>                                   | <b>Contribution to<br/>Final Score</b> |
|---------------|---|--|
| <b>1.</b>     | <b>Demonstrated ability to provide the services required for this Contract</b>                | <b>20%</b>                             |
|               | 1.1 Mobilisation  | 6%                                     |
|               | 1.2 Management Information System   | 4%                                     |
|               | 1.3 Accounting System   | 4%                                     |
|               | 1.4 Back Office   | 6%                                     |
| <b>2.</b>     | <b>Proposed systems and working methods</b>   | <b>30%</b>                             |
|               | 2.1 Cashless Parking  | 3%                                     |
|               | 2.2 Removal Operation   | 4%                                     |
|               | 2.3 Pound Provision   | 4%                                     |
|               | 2.4 Suspensions   | 3%                                     |
|               | 2.5 Pay and Display Machine Maintenance and Repair  | 2%                                     |
|               | 2.6 Pay and Display Cash Collection, Counting and Banking                                     | 2%                                     |
|               | 2.7 Permit Administration   | 2%                                     |
|               | 2.8 Statutory Documents   | 4%                                     |
|               | 2.9 Scanning of Correspondence  | 1%                                     |
|               | 2.10 Office Locations   | 2%                                     |
|               | 2.11 Call Centre  | 2%                                     |
|               | 2.12 Notice Processing  | 1%                                     |
| <b>3.</b>     | <b>Approach to customer care, client care and equalities</b>                                  | <b>15%</b>                             |
|               | 3.1 Staff Training and Development  | 5%                                     |
|               | 3.2 Contract Management Proposals   | 5%                                     |
|               | 3.3 Asset, Staff & Data Reversion Plan  | 5%                                     |
| <b>4.</b>     | <b>Enforcement plan</b>   | <b>25%</b>                             |
| <b>5.</b>     | <b>Proposals for enhancement of services and cost reduction over the life of the contract</b> | <b>10%</b>                             |
|               | Continuous Improvement Plan   | 7%                                     |
|               | 5.2 Added Value & Additional Information  | 3%                                     |
|               | <b>Quality Total</b>  | <b>100%<br/>of 35%</b>                 |
|               | Pricing Schedules   | 65%                                    |
|               | <b>Price Total</b>  | <b>65%</b>                             |



4.2.5 The marking scheme for the Quality evaluation is shown in table 2 below:

| <b>Table 2 Scoring Methodology for Method Statement</b> |  |              |
|---|--|--------------|
| Excellent   | Meets all criteria in a very full and comprehensive manner and exceeds some requirements   | 9-10 Points  |
| Very Good   | Generally satisfactory and meets the requirements of the criteria to the satisfaction of the Evaluation Panel  | 6-8 Points   |
| Satisfactory/Good                                       | Satisfactory but with aspects which cause the Evaluation Panel concern because either the response is incomplete, or differs from the professional / technical judgment of the Evaluation Panel on the requirements necessary to meet the criteria | 3-5 Points   |
| Unsatisfactory  | Little or none of the response is satisfactory, or little or no information has been provided  | 0 - 2 Points |

4.2.6. In terms of Price, the price evaluation was on the basis of the overall price over a 5 year period, based on 2013 rates current for the parking services.

Officers used a high - low methodology to calculate the score for each overall price which allocated a score in relation to the lowest price assessed. Each Tender was scored based on its relationship with the lowest priced Tender. (.i.e. the lower the cost per proposed parking services the higher the score, the higher the cost the lower the score).

4.2.7 Price was evaluated as follows: Lower costs received a better score. The scoring of the overall cost was given 65%. This was then weighted and aggregated to form the proportion of overall score of 100% to this bid.

4.2.8 Tenderers were made aware that their pricing of parking services must be realistic and supported by a credible approach to achieving the sustainable pricing over the delivery of the contract which they had to address in their proposals via the Method Statements.

4.2.9 A series of clarifications points with each bidder's response were identified from the evaluation panel.

4.2.10 These points were raised with the bidders; their responses received which enabled the evaluation panel to proceed with evaluating their bids. Where these have an effect on the scoring the overall evaluation has been adjusted to reflect these points of clarification

4.2.11 Tenderers were also made aware that the successful tenderer will be appointed from the highest aggregate score (i.e. quality + price) of the tender submission.

4.2.12 Tenderers were also advised that it was the Council's intention to take the two highest scoring bidders through to the BAFO stage of the procurement. We also advised that we reserved the right to take the third scoring bidder through to next stage of the competition if their bid was within 5% of the second bidder's price.

4.2.13 The following is an overall summary of the four bids received at ITT for providing the parking services. The comparisons are shown for each of four variations:

- ◆ With and without a performance bond
- ◆ With alternative IT options, numbered 1 and 2

Tender Evaluation for: 1 TOTAL (Performance Bond + IT Opt1) Parking Services

|                             | Suppliers |          |          |          |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                             | Bidder 1  | Bidder 2 | Bidder 3 | Bidder 4 |
| QUALITY SCORE RATING AS 35% | 28.96%    | 23.02%   | 25.23%   | 21.62%   |
| PRICING SCORE RATING AS 65% | 59.75%    | 64.60%   | 65.00%   | 48.69%   |
| TOTAL SCORE RATING AS 100%  | 88.71%    | 87.62%   | 90.23%   | 70.31%   |

Tender Evaluation for: 2 TOTAL (No Performance Bond + IT Opt1) Parking Services

|                             | Suppliers |          |          |          |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                             | Bidder 1  | Bidder 2 | Bidder 3 | Bidder 4 |
| QUALITY SCORE RATING AS 35% | 28.96%    | 23.02%   | 25.23%   | 21.62%   |
| PRICING SCORE RATING AS 65% | 59.93%    | 64.28%   | 65.00%   | 49.53%   |
| TOTAL SCORE RATING AS 100%  | 88.89%    | 87.30%   | 90.23%   | 71.15%   |

Tender Evaluation for: 3 TOTAL (Performance Bond + IT Opt2) Parking Services

| Selection Criteria          | Suppliers |          |          |          |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                             | Bidder 1  | Bidder 2 | Bidder 3 | Bidder 4 |
| QUALITY SCORE RATING AS 35% | 28.96%    | 23.02%   | 25.23%   | 21.62%   |
| PRICING SCORE RATING AS 65% | 60.03%    | 63.91%   | 65.00%   | 48.17%   |
| TOTAL SCORE RATING AS 100%  | 88.99%    | 86.93%   | 90.23%   | 69.79%   |

Tender Evaluation for: 4 TOTAL (No Performance Bond + IT Opt2) Parking Services

| Selection Criteria          | Suppliers |          |          |          |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                             | Bidder 1  | Bidder 2 | Bidder 3 | Bidder 4 |
| QUALITY SCORE RATING AS 35% | 28.96%    | 23.02%   | 25.23%   | 21.62%   |
| PRICING SCORE RATING AS 65% | 60.21%    | 63.59%   | 65.00%   | 48.99%   |
| TOTAL SCORE RATING AS 100%  | 89.17%    | 86.61%   | 90.23%   | 70.61%   |

4.2.11 One Organisation (Bidder 4) in terms of pricing was £11m adrift from the lowest price tenderer - the most competitive bidder. Their overall quality scores were satisfactory and were within the limits of acceptability. However the overwhelming price disparity between their bid and the other tenderers meant that they were automatically deselected from progressing to the next stage.

4.2.12 Following the evaluation, 3 suppliers were short-listed and invited to BAFO for the contract.

#### 4.3 Stage Three - Invitation to BAFO

4.3.1. Invitation to submit BAFO documents was sent to the three shortlisted organisations on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2013 with a return by date of 4<sup>th</sup> February 2013 extended to the 6<sup>th</sup> February 2013 in order to provide bidders with more time to review the Council's clarification responses which consisted of Ealing and Hounslow's Pensions Admissions Agreement including risk share provisions and review their bids accordingly prior to submission.

4.3.2 As part of the procurement process, bidders were advised that they would be required to attend a two day presentation and clarification session with the evaluation panel between the 16<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> of January 2013. Before the meetings all bidders were advised of 12 generic, but collective, areas of their bids that the evaluation panel wanted to explore further. All bidders were given the same information.

4.3.3 In order to assess BAFO returns, bidders were instructed that the same method statement that was included in the tender documentation will be submitted with track changes and a revised pricing schedule for completion was included in the BAFO documentation.

4.3.4 The BAFO documents that were issued to these bidders outlined the following evaluation process and criteria to identify the "most economically advantageous tender" in accordance with CSO requirements and EU Procurement Regulations. As per the ITT stage the instructions to bidders stated that contracts would be awarded on the basis of the most economically advantageous tender to the Council that would be evaluated using the criteria as follows:

4.3.5 The High Level Criteria of Quality 35% and Price 65%, the Quality sub-criteria and the quality marking scheme remained the same as in ITT see Table 1 and Table 2 above in section 4.6. The price evaluation criteria were subject to some refinement and addition.

4.3.6 The Pricing Evaluation again comprised 65% of the marks. These were allocated as shown:

| Area |  | Marks Allocated |
|------|--|-----------------|
| 1.   | Provision of robust and efficient Open Book Pricing Document and supporting information that meets stated requirements | 5               |
| 2.   | Lowest Price then allocated to costs in ascending order  | 55              |
| 3.   | Specific and costed added value items  | 5               |

4.3.7 The marking scheme for the open book evaluation was as follows in Table 3:

| <b>Table 3 Scoring Methodology for Pricing - Open Book</b> |  |          |
|--|--|----------|
| Excellent  | As Very Good but to a significantly better degree. Meets all criteria in a very full and comprehensive manner and frequently exceeds open book requirements with little need for clarification | 5 Points |
| Very Good  | Provides the open book as specified and exceeds some of the requirements.  | 4 Points |
| Good   | Fulfils the criteria and open book requirements to the satisfaction of the Evaluation Panel  | 3 Points |
| Limited  | Acceptable but does not meet the complete open book requirements to the satisfaction of the Evaluation Panel. Considerable clarification required  | 2 Points |
| Deficient  | Little or none of the response is satisfactory, doesn't meet the open book requirement.  | 1 Point  |

4.3.8 The Council reserved the right to reject any pricing submission that failed to meet the “open book” requirements in accordance with the open book definition clarified in detail in the new and additional pricing instructions as set out in the invitation to submit BAFO and instructions to bidders.

4.3.9 In terms of added value price evaluation, the added value evaluation was on the basis of the highest added value price of the parking services proposal to the Councils.

4.3.10 Officers used a high - low methodology to calculate the score for each added value price which allocated a score for each price in relation to the highest added value price assessed. Each added value price was scored based on its relationship with the highest added value price. (.i.e. the higher the added value the higher the score, the lower the added value the lower the score).

4.3.11 Added Value Price was evaluated as follows: higher added value received top score. The scoring of the highest added value was given 5%.

4.3.12 BAFOs were returned on the 6<sup>th</sup> February 2013 and the Evaluation Panel completed their evaluation by 14<sup>th</sup> February. An evaluation bid moderation session was held on the 14<sup>th</sup> February. A final bid evaluation including all moderation elements was completed on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2013.

4.3.13 Following the conclusion of evaluations, the evaluation panel identified a winning bidder and officers are recommending Bidder 3 be awarded the joint contract, based on their aggregate price and quality score, which represented the highest scoring BAFO submission.

4.3.14 The following two tables provide the overall summary on the high level criteria and the sub criteria summary of the three bids received at BAFO for providing the parking services:

| High Level Criteria                             |           |          |          |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|
| Award Criteria                                  | Suppliers |          |          |
|   | Bidder 1  | Bidder 2 | Bidder 3 |
| QUALITY SCORE RATING AS 35%                     | 29.89%    | 20.81%   | 25.92%   |
| PRICING SCORE RATING AS 65%                     | 57.40%    | 55.84%   | 63.00%   |
| TOTAL SCORE RATING<br>(Quality + Price) AS 100% | 87.29%    | 76.65%   | 88.92%   |

**Tender Evaluation for: 2 TOTAL (No Performance Bond + IT Opt1) Parking Services**

| Sub Criteria  |           |          |          |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|
| Selection Criteria  | Suppliers |          |          |
|   | Bidder 1  | Bidder 2 | Bidder 3 |
| Total Score for Section 1 -<br>Demonstrated ability to provide the<br>services required for this Contract                   | 17.54%    | 14.50%   | 15.66%   |
| Total Score for Section 2 - Proposed<br>systems and working methods   | 25.42%    | 19.85%   | 22.95%   |
| Total Score for Section 3 - Approach<br>to customer care, client care and<br>equalities                                     | 13.25%    | 8.42%    | 11.75%   |
| Total Score for Section 4 -<br>Enforcement Plan   | 20.43%    | 11.25%   | 16.68%   |
| Total Score for Section 5 - Proposals<br>for enhancement of services and<br>cost reduction over the life of the<br>contract | 8.78%     | 5.45%    | 7.03%    |
| Score Total - All Quality Sections  | 85.41%    | 59.47%   | 74.07%   |
| QUALITY SCORE RATING AS<br>100%   | 85.41%    | 59.47%   | 74.07%   |

|                             |        |        |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| QUALITY SCORE RATING AS 35% | 29.89% | 20.81% | 25.92% |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|

|   |        |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|--------|
| OPEN PRICING SCORE RATING<br>AS 5 %         | 4.00%  | 2.00%  | 3.00%  |
| ADDED VALUED PRICING SCORE<br>RATING AS 5 % | 1.73%  | 0.67%  | 5.00%  |
| OVERALL PRICE TENDERED AS<br>55%            | 51.67% | 53.17% | 55.00% |
| PRICING SCORE RATING AS 65%                 | 57.40% | 55.84% | 63.00% |

|   |        |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|--------|
| TOTAL SCORE (quality+price)<br>RATING AS 100% | 87.29% | 76.65% | 88.92% |
|---|--------|--------|--------|

## **5. Risks**

### **5.1 Risks to the timetable for contract award and mobilisation**

- 5.1.1 The partner boroughs, Ealing and Hounslow are seeking their own internal approvals from their respective Cabinets to award the joint contract. However should either of the partner boroughs fail to meet their internal approval timetable; this will affect Brent's ability to keep to the anticipated contract start date of 4<sup>th</sup> July, which includes a 3 month implementation period. The current Brent parking enforcement and IT notice processing contracts expire on 3 July 2013 following a 12 month extension to the original maximum term, agreed to cover the Olympic period. Brent has set out a clear timetable for the participating boroughs to adhere to which included a minimum 3 month implementation and mobilisation period which can be achieved if expected approval timetables are met. If the mobilisation period is reduced through late approval officers will work with the contractor to minimise the impact.
- 5.1.2 As Hounslow and Ealing have employees currently deployed in the provision of the services, TUPE will be applicable in respect of those employees. The transfer of Hounslow and Ealing's staff could impact on the scheduled contract implementation timetable. Hounslow currently operate both the on street enforcement and back office processes in house. Ealing operate their back office process in house with an external provider for the on street operations. Brent has no existing council staff that will be subject to TUPE. Staff from Brent's existing contractor, APCOA, will however also transfer under TUPE to Bidder 3.

### **5.2 Risks during the operation of the contract**

- 5.2.1 The Bidder 3 Enforcement Plan submitted as part of their BAFO reflects a significant development of the approach to on-street enforcement from that which has underpinned Brent's enforcement to date. The intention is to use a much more targeted and intelligent approach to the deployment of CEOs using ANPR vehicles and other means to both identify offences but more significantly to identify areas of non-compliance for concentrated enforcement action. This is very much the direction of travel we had anticipated during the life of the contract. Bidder 3 plan to deploy in this way from the start of the contract with significant reductions in the number of CEOs deployed on-street delivering significant savings.
- 5.2.2 It is of course important that the effectiveness of this new approach to deployment does not compromise the effectiveness of enforcement and that it sustains the appropriate level of enforcement to tackle the very real problems of non-compliance with parking regulations. To mitigate these risks Bidder 3 has offered an underpinning guarantee to the effectiveness of their solution details of which are in the confidential appendix.

## **6.0 Financial Implications**

- 6.1 The Council's Contract Standing Orders state that contracts for supplies and services exceeding £500k or works contracts exceeding £1million shall be referred to the Executive for approval to invite tenders and in respect of other matters identified in Standing Order 89.
- 6.2 The estimated value of this services contract was £45 million; this figure was based upon the current annual cost of £4.5 million in direct payments to the contractor over the initial 5 year term, and potential 5 year extension.

- 6.3 The estimated value of this services contract for Brent will be at least £19.3m over 5 years and £37.7 million over ten years; this figure is based upon the submitted year one cost of £4.4m, and the subsequent years costing £3.7m over a potential 10 year term. Annual savings arising from the contract after year one will amount to at least £850k.
- 6.4 Because the new contract starts in July 2013 in year one, the first three months for 2013/14 will incur higher costs from the existing contract. There are some one off costs arising from the new contract which will also lead to higher costs in year one than in later years of the contract. The impact of this will be that some apportionment adjustment pertaining to the general costs and premises between boroughs will be required during the implementation period.
- 6.5 It is anticipated that the cost of this contract will be funded from existing resources with budget adjustments being made to current levels of expenditure from the parking account in line with the below table:

| <b>F Y</b> | <b>April - Jun</b> | <b>Jul - Mar</b> | <b>FY Exp.</b>        | <b>Budget Adjustment</b> |
|------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2013/2014  | £ 1,145,404.50     | £ 3,325,692.56   | <b>£ 4,471,097.06</b> | <b>-£ 110,520.94</b>     |
| 2014/2015  | £ 1,108,564.19     | £ 2,794,080.24   | <b>£ 3,902,644.42</b> | <b>-£ 568,452.63</b>     |
| 2015/2016  | £ 931,360.08       | £ 2,794,080.24   | <b>£ 3,725,440.32</b> | <b>-£ 177,204.11</b>     |
| 2016/2017  | £ 931,360.08       | £ 2,794,080.24   | <b>£ 3,725,440.32</b> |                          |

- 6.5 Substantial levels of investment will be made in new technology and infrastructure by the contractor over the implementation period of the new contract. The Council anticipate that this investment will enable future efficiencies as the contract matures.
- 6.6 Over the first two years of the contract term, indexed growth will be frozen in accordance with contract terms and conditions. From year three, inflationary growth will be linked to the National Joint Council for Local Government Services salary scales.
- 6.8 This contract, as Members will be aware, is responsible for collection of very substantial income to the council. The proposed contract deals in detail with the financial consequences of non-performance for the contractor. Details are commercially confidential and are set out in Appendix 1.

## **7.0 Staffing Implications**

- 7.1 This service is currently provided in Brent by an external contractor APCOA Parking Services (UK) Limited and there are no implications for Council staff arising from retendering the contract at this stage.
- 7.2 An alternative contractor has been recommended for award of contract, therefore the incumbent Contractor's staff currently deployed in the provision of the services will transfer pursuant to the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations, 2006 from the current contractor to the successful contractor.
- 7.3 The levels of staffing required by the incoming contractor are substantially less than the existing establishment as a result of efficiencies driven through new working methods and technological advancement. The incoming contractor shall consult the incumbent contractor's workforce in the mobilisation phase of the contract in order to determine how the staffing reductions may be realised.

## **8.0 Legal Implications**

- 8.1 The parking services are a mixture of part A and B services under the EU public procurement legislation. The parking services were procured collaboratively with other WLA Authorities, with the Council acting as lead authority on their behalf and as such, it was the Council who had responsibility for following the correct procurement procedure. Members are referred to the substantive legal implications regarding this collaborative procurement as contained in the 16 July 2012 Executive report, for information.
- 8.2 The proposed Parking Services contract is a High Value services contract (exceeding £500,000 over the life of the contract) and as such, in accordance with the Council's Contract Standing Orders, the Executive is required to review and agree the award of contract in accordance with Contract Standing Order 88(c).
- 8.3 Officers have followed a fair and transparent tender process, which is clearly set out within the body of this report.
- 8.4 Although this parking services contract has been classified as a Part B Services Contract, Officers have determined that the award of the joint contract will be subject to a voluntary minimum 10 calendar day standstill period before the contract can be awarded. Members should note that the 10 day standstill period will commence the day after the last remaining partner borough has gained approval to award the contract from its Cabinet (see table set out in paragraph 10.0 below). Therefore subject to Executive approval by all three boroughs, all tenderers will be issued with written notification of the award decision. A minimum 10 calendar day standstill period will then be observed before the contract is formally awarded and executed – this period will begin the day after all Tenderers are sent notification of the award decision – and additional debrief information will be provided to unsuccessful tenderers in accordance with the EU Regulations. The standstill period provides unsuccessful tenderers with an opportunity to challenge the Council's award decision if such challenge is justifiable. However, if no such challenge or successful challenge is brought during the period, then as soon as possible after the standstill period ends, the successful contractor will be issued with a letter of acceptance notifying them of the award, implementation period and commencement date.
- 8.5 Following award of the contract, the Council will be required to publish a contract award notice in the Official Journal of the European Community within 48 days of award.
- 8.6 In procuring the parking services contract, Brent Council agreed that all partner boroughs shall enter into and execute an Inter Authority Agreement for the duration of the proposed joint services contract. The Inter Authority Agreement, as referred to within the body of the report at paragraph 3.3.1 shall contain relevant provision so as to enable the effective delivery of the services.
- 8.7 Brent and the participating WLA members will execute a single joint contract with the successful contractor. Consequently, the draft Inter Authority Agreement and the joint Services Contract contains provisions covering the circumstances should a partner borough decide to withdraw from the joint contract arrangement during the contract period.



## 9.0 Diversity Implications

- 9.1 The proposals in this report have been subject to screening and officers believe that there are no diversity implications.

## 10.0 Accommodation Implications

- 10.1 The lease on Brent's premises at Pyramid House used by the current enforcement contractor, including the car pound, has been extended for the remainder of the existing parking contract; it is anticipated that the existing service including removal of impounded vehicles to the new pound will be fully decommissioned before the end of July 2013. The successful enforcement contractor will provide the premises from which to operate, together with car pound facilities although it is anticipated that some of these facilities will be shared with the other Boroughs.

## 10.0 Timetable for Implementation

| Action   | Date  |
|--|---|
| Executive decision to award (including Scrutiny calling in period with exemption for Ealing being concurrent with standstill period) | 18 <sup>th</sup> March 2013 For Brent<br>19 <sup>th</sup> March 2013 For Hounslow<br>19 <sup>th</sup> March 2013 For Ealing |
| Standstill Period  | 20 <sup>th</sup> March 2013 – 2 <sup>nd</sup> April 2013  |
| Contract Award   | 3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2013  |
| Contract Commencement Date   | 4 <sup>th</sup> July 2013   |

## 11.0 Appendices

Appendix 1 – The tender process and evaluation comprising commercial-in-confidence information.

## 12.0 Background Papers

- Parking Contracts Extension executive report December 2011.
- Cross-Borough Procurement of Cultural Services Executive report January 2012.
- Authority to Tender - Collaborative Cross Borough Procurement of Parking Services July 2012.
- Update on the Cross Borough Parking collaboration Sept 2012

### Contact Officer(s)

Katerina Athanasiadou  
Senior Category Manager

Tel: 020 8937 4118

Email: [Katerina.athanasiadou@brent.gov.uk](mailto:Katerina.athanasiadou@brent.gov.uk)

Michael Read  
Assistant Director, Environment & Protection

Tel: 020 8937 5302

Email: [michael.read@brent.gov.uk](mailto:michael.read@brent.gov.uk)

**Sue Harper**

**Director of Environment and Neighbourhood Services**

## Appendix 1

### NOT FOR PUBLICATION

#### Reason for non-publication


This Appendix 1 of the report is not for publication as it contains the following categories of exempt information as specified in Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act.

***Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).***

Reports containing exempt information can be withheld from the public and the public may be excluded from a meeting at which the report is to be considered but this is a matter of discretion. The categories of exempt information are set out in the Access to Information Rules in the Constitution. The relevant category of exempt information is:

### 3

The Council has received representations from the Partner Authority to the proposed joint contract that requires the identity of the recommended bidder for award of contract to be classified as exempt by virtue of Schedule 12A, paragraph 4 of the Local Government Act 1972. However the partner authorities including Brent Council intend to issue a joint press announcement naming the successful bidder on or after the 21<sup>st</sup> March 2013.

|   |  |
|---|--|
|  | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>One Council Overview and<br/>Scrutiny Committee<br/>21 March 2013</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>PERFORMANCE &amp; FINANCE<br/>REVIEW</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Report from<br/>Director of Strategy, Partnerships &amp;<br/>Improvement<br/>and<br/>Deputy Director of Finance</b></p> |
| For Action  | Wards Affected:<br>ALL   |
| <b>Performance and Finance Review, Quarter 3, 2012-13</b>                         |  |

## 1.0 Introduction

Brent's Borough Plan 'Brent our Future' is a four year strategy document which sets out the Administration's priorities over the coming years. These priorities form the core of our Corporate Planning Framework, which is broadly based around three overarching strategic objectives:

1. To create a sustainable built environment that drives economic regeneration and reduces poverty, inequality and exclusion.
2. To provide excellent public services which enable people to achieve their full potential, promote community cohesion and improve our quality of life.
3. To improve services for residents by working with our partners to deliver local priorities more effectively and achieve greater value for money from public resources.

The planned reduction in central government funding over the remaining three years of the Government's current Spending Review and beyond continues to intensify pressure on Council services, and difficult economic conditions have directly affected levels of employment across the borough. The scale and pace of national policy changes, particularly in relation to Housing Benefits

and the implementation of the new Universal Credit, is expected to fuel increased demand for services, which will have an enduring effect on the borough. However despite these challenges, the Council remains committed to preserving services and protecting the most vulnerable residents.

The purpose of this report is to provide Members with a corporate overview of Finance and Performance information to support informed decision-making and manage performance effectively.





## 2.0 Recommendations

The committee is asked to:

- a. Note the Finance and Performance information contained in this report and agree remedial actions as necessary.
- b. Challenge progress with responsible officers as necessary.

## 3.0 Executive Summary - Performance

There are currently 38% of indicators on target (green) or just below target (amber) and 21% are well below target (red). The rest are considered indicative only and have no targets set. Please note that indicators with no data returns against them are classed as high risk.

| Overall Council Performance  |   |   |   |   |            |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|
|                              |  |  |  |  | Total      |
|                              | Low   | Med   | High  | IO  | Total      |
| <b>Adult social care</b>     | 1   | 0   | 4   | 7   | 12         |
| <b>Children and families</b> | 10  | 0   | 2   | 4   | 16         |
| <b>Environment &amp; NS</b>  | 5   | 0   | 6   | 2   | 13         |
| <b>Regeneration &amp; MP</b> | 4   | 3   | 1   | 8   | 16         |
| <b>Central services</b>      | 2   | 2   | 2   | 8   | 14         |
| <b>Total</b>                 | 22  | 5   | 15  | 29  | 71         |
| <b>Percentage</b>            | <b>31</b>   | <b>7</b>  | <b>21</b>   | <b>41</b>   | <b>100</b> |

The performance section of the Performance and Finance Review report now includes a benchmarking column which will provide information from the London Council's benchmarking club. Benchmarking will only be available for those indicators that other councils also wish to benchmark against. To ensure that the information relevant and meaningful it is drawn from the same quarter in the previous financial year. So for this quarter the information provided comes from Q3 2011/12.

### 3.1 ***Adult Social Services***

Data quality issues are still being addressed by the service. As part of this work a more robust data collection method for reporting the percentage of clients receiving self directed support (direct payment and individual budget) has been introduced and now includes mental health data. This indicator is below target but has improved since quarter 2. Performance in relation to the timeliness of social care assessments for mental health clients is showing a slight decline and remains below target. However once an assessment has taken place the packages of care are delivered within timescales. The percentage of carers receiving need assessment or review and a carer's service has declined since quarter 2 largely due to an increase in the total number of clients and a smaller proportional rise in those receiving a service.

### 3.2 ***Children and Families***

Quarter 3 shows a surplus of school places available in for all key stages and all three indicators are now showing as green. Whilst the percentage of care leavers in employment, education and training is still below target there has been an improvement since quarter 2 to from 42% to the current 54% against a target of 64%. The snapshot measure of the number of looked after children in Brent shows a slight increase in quarter 3, while the number of looked after children placed in in-house foster carers has gone down since quarter 2 and now has a high risk status. The sustained pressure in Children's Social Care looks likely to continue for the foreseeable future. A suite of four co-ordinated One Council projects that collectively deliver a 'Working with Families' initiative in Brent is currently at the delivery stage. The aim of the projects is to provide early help and ensure better coordination between departments and agencies reducing fragmentation and balancing demand with resources.

### 3.3 ***Environment and Neighbourhood Services***

The time lag in producing figures for the volume of residual waste and percentage of household waste sent for recycling means that data is provided one quarter in arrears. New local indicators have been developed to measure the number of small and large flytips in the borough. The number of small flytips reported in quarter 3 is a high risk status while the number of large flytips reported is showing a low risk status. The number of enforcement inspections and investigations is below target and is red, however the number of enforcement actions taken is above target and green. A new local indicator which reflects the number of active library users as a percentage of the population has been included, this shows a year to date total of 19.9% against a target of 21%.

### 3.4 ***Regeneration and Major Projects***

Quarter 3 has seen little overall movement in the employment and housing related indicators though the employment rate shows a slight positive move from 63.1% in quarter 2 to 64.1% in quarter 3. The number of households in temporary accommodation has been increasing since quarter 1, though this is within the forecasted rise and is currently showing a low risk status. The current rent collection rate is slightly above target and is highlighted in the appendix as a low risk. The average number of days taken to re-let a property is below target and a low risk. The pressure on employment and housing indicators, largely driven by a range of external factors, such as the overall economic conditions, look set to continue and while the delay in the introduction of the benefits cap is welcome, efforts are underway to mitigate its impact as far as possible. Actions to mitigate the impact of welfare reform, to implement the council's new employment offer and to make effective use of the flexibility provided by the housing reform are central to the departments work programme. The percentage of major planning applications determined in 13 weeks is high risk and remains a cause of concern. While one or two difficult negotiations can have a huge impact on this indicator the department are proposing to undertake a fundamental review of the service during 2013/14.

### **3.5 Central Services**

New indicators for violence with injury offences and the number of motor vehicle crime offences have now been included to better reflect local priorities. The number of personal robberies (cumulative) has moved from amber to green. The Council Tax collection rate is currently amber, though it is envisaged that this will end the year on target.

### **3.6 Complaints Summary**

Overall council-wide complaint numbers at the local resolution stage remained virtually the same as in quarter 2. Complaint response times improved from 54% within target in quarter 2 to 75% in quarter 3. Work undertaken with the Children & Families Departmental Management team has resulted in a marked improvement in response times from 25% within target to 71%. A project with Adult Social Care aimed at bringing long term improvement in response times has resulted in an improvement from 24% to 37%.

## 4.0 Executive Summary - FINANCE

4.1 The Council's revenue budget position for quarter 3 is as follows:

| Item                                    | Budget<br>£000 | Forecast<br>Outturn<br>£000 | Variance<br>£000 |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Adult Social Services                   | 91,028         | 91,114                      | 86               |
| Children & Families                     | 46,253         | 46,303                      | 50               |
| Environment & Neighbourhood<br>Services | 34,096         | 34,564                      | 468              |
| Regeneration & Major Projects           | 33,510         | 32,510                      | (1,000)          |
| Central Services                        | 37,565         | 37,296                      | (269)            |
| Transfer to Reserves                    | 0              | 1,000                       | 1,000            |
| <b>Service Area Total</b>               | <b>242,452</b> | <b>242,787</b>              | <b>335</b>       |
| Central Items                           | 17,940         | 16,880                      | (1,060)          |
| <b>Total Council Budget</b>             | <b>260,392</b> | <b>259,667</b>              | <b>(725)</b>     |

- At the end of quarter three the forecast position is for a net underspend on service area budgets of £665k before taking account of a £1m transfer to earmarked reserves to help meet the additional cost pressures on the temporary accommodation budget in 2013/14. This together with an underspend of £1.060m on central items and Government Grants gives an overall underspend of £725k. This is an improvement of £658k on quarter 2 underspend of £67k. The main reasons for this are improvements in the outturn position for Adults Social Services, Regeneration and Major Projects and Central Items. The result is that, on the basis of forecasts at the end of quarter 3, general fund balances at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 will be £12.041m. This is £961k better than the originally budgeted balances of £11.080m.
- Children & Families is currently forecasting an overspend of £50k, a change of £38k on the £12k overspend reported in quarter 2. There continue to be pressures on the children's social care purchasing and placement budget although steps have been taken during the year to reduce these costs
- Adult Social Services' current forecasts are that the outturn overspend will reduce to £86k, some £452k less than the forecast of £538k at quarter 2. The department is working hard to identify new areas to bring this down further, so that at year end it hopes to have a balanced budget position. The financial pressure in 2012/13 relates to the shortfall in funding for transitions over the last two financial years, a pressure of £1m and the department has worked continuously to reduce this with compensating underspends in other areas of the budget.
- Environment and Neighbourhood Services is currently forecasting an overspend of £468k for 2012/13. The projected tonnages on waste and

recycling have increased since quarter 2 and current forecasts are for a £796k overspend predominantly around higher than anticipated tonnages for residual waste to landfill. There continue to be issues over staffing costs following the wave 2 staffing and structure review and a shortfall in highways and licensing income. To meet the overspend £443k of balance sheet deposits and provisions no longer required will be written back. Negotiations are also taking place with Veolia to achieve lower gate fees, a reduction in vehicle costs and a review of rounds. Action is also being taken to review agency and freeze vacant posts and non essential spend. Overall the position is £316k worse than quarter 2.

- The main pressure within Regeneration and Major Projects was envisaged at the start of the year to be the housing benefit scheme changes resulting from the introduction of the Local Housing Allowance caps in April 2011. Temporary Accommodation budget includes growth of £1.134m in order to assist in managing the cost pressures and increased service demand. The pressures on the temporary accommodation and housing benefit budgets are not as high as projected and it is currently showing an underspend of £861k in total. The forecast outturn is now expected to be £1.0m an improvement of £500k on the quarter 2 position. It is proposed that expected surplus on Regeneration & Major Projects for 2012/13 will be set aside in a reserve to help meet the additional temporary accommodation pressures in 2013/14.
  - Central Services' forecast outturn position remains unchanged from the quarter 2 position of a £269k underspend. This covers an underspend on vacant posts in the policy area of Strategy, Performance & Improvement.
  - The position on central items has improved from the breakeven position in quarter 2 to an underspend of £1.060m. The main factors in this improvement are an increase of £568k on the underspending on capital financing to £1.177m. This reflects the successful debt restructuring exercises in previous years, new borrowing at lower than anticipated interest rates, higher than estimated interest receipts and improved cash flow. The current low level of interest rates continues to be beneficial to this budget. It is also expected that there will be £150k underspend on premature retirement compensation reflecting the on-going reduction in the number of pensioners to which this applies. It is also anticipated that there will be £237k underspend on the carbon tax budget. Carbon tax is paid in arrears and the outturn for 2011/12 has turned out to be lower than expected with a total payment of £279k of which £212k was applicable to schools. This pattern of spend is unlikely to change in 2012/13 leading to the underspend.
- 
- The position on forecast balances after quarter 3 is detailed below:



|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
|  | £m                   |
| Balances Brought Forward 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2012  | 10.316               |
| General Fund Contribution to Balances                | 1.000                |
| 2012/13 Underspend                                   | 0.725                |
| Forecast Carried Forward 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2013 | <b><u>12.041</u></b> |

Overall Including the in year underspend of £725k and the budgeted contribution of £1m to balances in 2012/13 the forecast balances at 31<sup>st</sup> March are now forecast to be £12.041m which is an improvement of £961k on the budgeted figure of £11.080m and a £658k improvement since quarter 2.

4.2 The Council's capital budget position for Quarter 3 is as follows:

| Item                                    | QTR 2<br>Revised<br>Budget<br>£000 | QTR 3<br>Proposed<br>Budget<br>£000 | Forecast<br>£000 | Variance<br>£000 |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Adult Social Services                   | 1,552                              | 1,532                               | 1,532            | 0                |
| Children & Families                     | 0                                  | 883                                 | 883              | 0                |
| Environment &<br>Neighbourhood Services | 17,489                             | 15,636                              | 15,636           | 0                |
| Regeneration & Major<br>Projects        | 213,052                            | 154,571                             | 154,571          | 0                |
| Housing – General Fund                  | 8,357                              | 6,845                               | 6,845            | 0                |
| Housing - HRA                           | 19,271                             | 12,523                              | 12,523           | 0                |
| Central Services                        | 3,938                              | 3,938                               | 3,938            | 0                |
| <b>Total Capital Programme</b>          | <b>263,659</b>                     | <b>195,928</b>                      | <b>195,928</b>   | <b>(0)</b>       |

The proposed quarter 3 budget results in no forecast overspends in the capital programme. Full details of the movements between the quarter 2 budget and proposed quarter 3 budget are given in the attached Finance Appendix.

## 5.0 Financial implications

These are set out in the attached Performance and Finance Review quarter 3 appendix.

## 6.0 Legal implications

The capital programme is agreed by Full Council as part of the annual budget process. Changes to or departures from the budget during the year (other than those by Full Council) can only be agreed in accordance with the Scheme of Transfers and Virements contained in the Council's Constitution. Any decisions the Executive wishes to take and any changes in policy which are not in accordance with the budget and are not covered by the Scheme of Transfers and Virements will need to be referred to Full Council.

The Director of Finance and Corporate Services is satisfied that the criteria in the scheme are satisfied in respect of virements and spending proposals in this report.

## **7.0 Diversity implications**

This report has been subject to screening by officers and there are no direct diversity implications.

## **8.0 Contact officers**

Cathy Tyson (Assistant Director, Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement)  
Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane, Wembley Middlesex, HA9 9HD 020 8937 1030

Mick Bowden (Deputy Director, Finance and Corporate Services) Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane, Wembley Middlesex, HA9 9HD 020 8937 1460.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>PHIL NEWBY</b><br><b>Director of Strategy, Partnerships &amp; Improvement</b> | <b>MICK BOWDEN</b><br><b>Deputy Director of Finance &amp; Corporate Services</b> |
|--|--|



**Brent**

**Performance & Finance  
Review**

# **Performance Report 2012-13 Quarter 3**

This report is designed to supplement the covering Performance & Finance Review report. It summarizes the Council's key performance indicators for the current reporting period.





**Produced by: Strategy, Partnerships & Improvement and  
Finance & Corporate Services**

# How to interpret this report





This report is designed to supplement the covering Performance & Finance Review report and includes a much wider suite of performance indicators. It summarizes performance information in relation to the Health & Wellbeing Strategy and other strategies which collectively enable the Council to deliver Brent's Borough Plan.

The indicators contained in this report are those which are considered essential at the current time, given the pressures which the Council faces, and are reported on a quarterly basis. The Council also has a suite of annual performance indicators which are reported on an annual basis.

**Performance information** is assessed using the following "Alert" symbols:

|   |   |
|---|---|
|  | If performance is below target.   |
|  | If performance is below the level of expected performance but is within tolerance of the target.  |
|  | If performance is as expected and the target has been met or exceeded.  |
|  | If performance cannot be fairly measured against a target because it is difficult to set a target or influence performance due to external factors then the indicator is marked as indicative only. |

**Finance information** is assessed using the following symbols:

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | If there is an overspend on the budget of more than £50k or more than 5% of the budget.   |
|  | If there is an overspend on the budget of up to £50k or less than 5% of the budget.   |
|  | If the budget is underspent or at breakeven. Or additionally, for capital budgets where increased expenditure is matched by an equivalent sum of additional funding. In these cases the capital programme remains in balance and no further action is required. |
|  | If there has been slippage in the Capital Programme with expenditure being re-phased to future years.   |

The LAPS Benchmark figures– are the national average benchmark figures taken from LAPS for the same quarter the previous year.

# PUBLIC HEALTH

| Reference          | Performance Indicator   | 2011-12 End of Year | LAPS Bench-mark 2011-12 Q3 | 2012-13 Year to date | 2012-13 Current Target | Alert | Definition  |
|--------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------|---|
| Local via the PCT  | Number of hospital admissions for over 65s.                     |                     |                            |                      |                        |       | Cumulative. Measures the number of people aged 65 and over who are admitted to hospital.  |
| NI 40 via the PCT  | Number of drug users recorded as being in effective treatment.  | 1245                |                            | 1233 (Q2)            |                        |       | Cumulative on a 12 month rolling programme. Measures the number of drug users recorded as being in effective treatment after triage.    |
| Local via the PCT  | Tuberculosis Treatment completion rates, (percentage of cases). | 87.4                |                            | 85.1%                | 85%                    |       | In arrears. Rolling year Jan-Sept 2011. Measures the number of people who, having been diagnosed with TB complete treatment programmes. |
| NI 121 via the PCT | Mortality rate from all circulatory diseases at ages under 75.  |                     |                            | 76.5 (2010)          |                        |       | In arrears for 2010. Measures mortality rates from all circulatory diseases per 100,000 per calendar year.                              |
| NI 112 via the PCT | Under 18 conception rates.                                      |                     | 37.5                       | 36.2 (Q2 2010)       |                        |       | Q4 2010 actual. Delayed reporting 12 months in arrears. Data supplied by PCT.   |

## Comments

- TB Treatment Completion Rates – based on notifications received until 30<sup>th</sup> September 2011 followed up to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2012; this is just above the set target for the whole borough. Please note that it is the latest performance data available for up to Jun-2011, based on historical performance due to the criteria set for this measure. HPA reports performance reports and compares performance on calendar year and the last one is for 2010, 88.9%. NB: There are some changes in their reporting practice this year.
- Mortality Rate from Circulatory Diseases for under 75's – this figure is for 2010. Finalised data for 2011 should be available in December.
- Teenage Pregnancy Rate – Figure provided is the latest finalised figure available.










# ADULT SOCIAL CARE

| Reference | Performance Indicator  | 2011-12 End of year | LAPS Bench mark 2011-12 Q3 | 2012-13 Year to date | 2012-13 Current YTD Target | Alert | Definition  |
|-----------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-------|---|
| NI 125    | Percentage of over 65s who are still at home after 91 days following discharge.  | 89%                 |                            | Annual               | 90%                        | ●     | Measures the percentage of over 65s who are still at home after 91 days following hospital discharge into the Council's re-ablement services. |
| NI 130    | Social Care clients receiving self-directed support.                             | 53.48%              | 42.7%                      | 40.0%                | 49.0%                      | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the percentage of clients receiving self-directed support per 100,000 of population.                                     |
| NI 132    | Timeliness of Social Care assessments: (Mental Health Only).                     | 75.51%              |                            | 51%                  | 70%                        | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the percentage of adult assessments completed within 4 weeks   |
| NI 133    | Timeliness of Social Care packages following assessment. (Mental Health Only).   | 100%                |                            | 100%                 | 95%                        | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the percentage social care packages put in place within the recommended timelines following assessment.                  |
| NI 135    | Percentage of carers receiving needs assessment or review and a carer's service. | 29%                 | 24.5%                      | 12%                  | 23%                        | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the percentage of carers receiving needs assessment or review and a specific carer's service, or advice and information. |
| Local     | Quarterly number of delayed hospital discharges (Social Services).               | 33                  |                            | 13                   | 6                          | ●     | Measures the quarterly number of delayed discharges from hospitals.   |
| Local     | Number of clients living in the community and receiving a service.               | 4852                |                            | 4628                 | Indicative only            | ●     | Measures the number of clients who are currently living independently in the community.   |
| Local     | Number of clients in nursing and residential care.                               | 1019                |                            | 1005                 | Indicative only            | ●     | Latest. Gives a snapshot of social care clients in nursing and residential care in the borough.   |
| Local     | Number of clients in residential care who suffer from dementia                   | 152                 |                            | 198                  | Indicative only            | ●     | Latest. Gives a snapshot of the number of residential care clients who also have dementia.  |








| Reference   | Performance Indicator   | 2011-12 End of year | LAPS Bench mark 2011-12 Q3 | 2012-13 Year to date | 2012-13 Current YTD Target | Alert | Definition  |
|-------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-------|---|
| Local       | Number of adult contacts who were eligible after Fair Access to Care screening. | 3028                |                            | 2115                 | Indicative only            | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the total number of clients who were eligible to receive re-ablement or long-term services after assessment. |
| Local CMP10 | Total number of complaints received (stage 1).                                  | 95                  |                            | 81                   | Indicative only            | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the number of new complaints relating to each service area at the first stage.                               |
| Local CMP11 | Total number of complaints escalated to stage 2.                                | 3                   |                            | 1                    | Indicative only            | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the number of complaints over the year that were not resolved at stage 1 and escalated to stage 2.           |

| Comments  |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NI125 – This is an annual indicator. The snapshot measures the number of older people (65 and over) who have been discharged from hospital between 1st Oct – 31st Dec, are still living at home 3 months later (Jan – March). Therefore this information will not be available until the end of the financial year at the earliest.</li> <li>NI130 – The collection method for this indicator has changed from Q1 to Q2 to a more robust method and hence the performance data is more reliable. Q2's data was amended to include mental health data.</li> <li>NI132 - The number of assessments completed within 28 days has decreased for this quarter and the number of assessments taking more than 4 weeks has increased overall which has brought the percentages down.</li> </ul> |

# CHILDREN & FAMILIES

| Reference | Performance Indicator   | 2011-12 End of year | LAPS Bench mark 2011-12 Q3 | 2012-13 Year to date | 2012-13 Current YTD Target | Alert   | Definition   |
|-----------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| NI 114    | Rate of permanent exclusions.   | 0.60                | 0.1                        | 0.31                 | 1.0                        |    | Measures the annual rate of exclusions from Brent-maintained schools per 1000 pupils.  |
| Local     | Net shortfall of places at Key Stage 1                                    | -439                |                            | 36                   | 0                          |    | Measures the number of unplaced pupils in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 compared to the number of vacancies for 4-6 year olds. <b>Negative = shortfall, positive = surplus.</b> |
| Local     | Net shortfall of places at Key Stage 2                                    | 57                  |                            | 67                   | 0                          |    | Measures the number of unplaced pupils in Years 3,4,5,6 compared to the number of vacancies for 7-10 year olds. <b>Negative = shortfall, positive = surplus.</b>               |
| Local     | Net shortfall of places at Key Stage 3                                    | 388                 |                            | 550                  | 0                          |    | Measures the number of unplaced pupils in Years 7,8,9,10,11 compared to the number of vacancies for 11-16 year olds. <b>Negative = shortfall, positive = surplus.</b>          |
| NI 117    | Percentage of 16 to 18 year old NEETs                                     | 3.9%                | 4.8%                       | 3.1%                 | 5%                         |  | Measures the percentage of 16 to 18 year olds who are not in Education, Employment or Training.  |
| NI 148    | Percentage of care leavers in employment, education or training           | 64%                 | 55.8%                      | 54%                  | 64%                        |  | Measures the percentage of care leavers who are in Education, Employment or Training.  |
| Local     | Percentage of parents completing evidence based parenting programmes      | 31%                 |                            | 60%                  | 50%                        |  | Measures the percentage of teenage mothers registered with Brent children's centres. Demand led = target represents the London Average.  |
| Local     | Proportion of child referrals to social care, which are repeat referrals. | 17%                 |                            | 12.1%                | 17.2%                      |  | Measures the percentage of children within the social care service which are repeat referrals.   |
| Local     | Number of under 18 year olds subject to a child protection plan.          | 173                 |                            | 134                  | N/A                        |  | Indicative only: target for monitoring. Measures the number of under-18 year olds who have a child protection plan in place.   |















| Reference   | Performance Indicator   | 2011-12 End of year | LAPS Bench mark 2011-12 Q3  | 2012-13 Year to date | 2012-13 Current YTD Target | Alert   | Definition   |
|-------------|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| NI 062      | Stability of placements for looked after children (LACs): number of moves.  | 14.2%               | 9.2%                        | 8.6%                 | 13%                        |    | Cumulative: Measures the rate of looked after children (as part of Brent LAC total) who have had 3 or more different placements. |
| NI 062 d    | Number of looked after children in Brent.                                   | 371                 |                             | 346                  | Indicative only            |    | Snapshot: Measures the number of looked after children in Brent.   |
| Local       | Number of looked after children placed with Independent Fostering Agencies. | 101                 |                             | 89                   | 100                        |    | Measures the number of looked after children placed with independent fostering agencies.   |
| Local       | Number of looked after children placed with in-house foster carers.         | 113                 |                             | 111                  | 127                        |    | Measures the number of looked after children placed with local foster carers in Brent.   |
| NI 019      | Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders in Brent.                    | 35%                 | 4.9% (8 returns inc. Brent) | 32%                  | 37%                        |  | Measures the percentage of young offenders who go on to re-offend.   |
| Local CMP10 | Total number of complaints received (stage 1).                              | 181                 |                             | 132                  | Indicative only            |  | Cumulative. Measures the number of new complaints relating to each service area at the first stage.                              |
| Local CMP11 | Total number of complaints escalated to stage 2.                            | 13                  |                             | 5                    | Indicative only            |  | Cumulative. Measures the number of complaints over the year that were not resolved at stage 1 and escalated to stage 2.          |

#### Comments

- NI 117 (NEETs): This figure is provisional as returns have not been confirmed with DfE. This usually happens mid-month. The NEET target is measured as an average over the 3 months November to January each year. In 2011 2012 Brent was the joint 10th best performing LA nationally on this indicator. Although the performance for November 2012 to January 2013 will not be known until mid February 2013, we are currently on track to meet the target.
- There have been 12 Parenting Programmes to date, with 121 participating in total. Of these 121 parents, 73 completed the programme.










# ENVIRONMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES








| Reference   | Performance Indicator  | 2011-12 End of year | LAPS Bench mark 2011-12 Q3 | 2012-13 Year to date | 2012-13 Current YTD Target | Alert   | Definition  |
|-------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| NI 191      | Volume of residual waste kg per household.                             | 557                 | 292.6 (Q2)                 | 241 (Q2)             | 219.5 (Q2)                 |    | Cumulative. Measures household waste that is not re-used, recycled or composted.                                |
| NI 192      | Percentage of household waste sent for recycling.                      | 37%                 | 35.4% (Q2)                 | 47.05% (Q2)          | 46.5% (Q2)                 |    | Measures the percentage of household waste re-used, recycled or composted.                                      |
| Local       | Tonnes of waste sent to landfill.                                      | 73,524              |                            | 35,256 (Q2)          | 28,250 (Q2)                |    | Measures the volume of waste sent to landfill sites.  |
| Local       | Number of small reported flytips                                       | 2106                |                            | 1826                 | 1571                       |    | Latest. Measures the number of small fly tipping incidents reported   |
| Local       | Number of large reported flytips                                       | 5046                |                            | 3687                 | 3750                       |    | Latest. Measures the number of large fly tipping incidents reported   |
| Local       | Flytipping Enforcement: No of Inspections and Investigations           | 4337                |                            | 1307                 | 2850                       |   | Latest. Measures the number of inspections and investigations relating to fly tipping incidents                 |
| Local       | Flytipping Enforcement: No of Enforcement Actions Taken                | 614                 |                            | 166                  | 114                        |  | Latest. Measures the number of enforcement actions taken relating to fly tipping incidents                      |
| Local       | Number of library visits per 1000 population.                          | 5873                |                            | 3449                 | 4448                       |  | Cumulative. Measures the number of visits to Brent libraries.   |
| Local       | Active library users as a percentage of population.                    | 15.6%               |                            | 19.9%                | 21.0%                      |  | Measures the proportion of people to borrow books from the libraries.   |
| Local       | Number of visits to Brent Sports Centres to partake in sports activity | 1.24m               |                            | 949,669              | 908472                     |  | Cumulative. Measures the number of adults to visit sports centres to actively partake in sport.                 |
| NI 195a     | Percentage of Streets below standard for litter.                       | 15.3%               | 5.9%                       | 11.1%                | 15%                        |  | Measures the percentage of streets which fail to meet environmental cleanliness standards. Per 4 month tranche. |
| Local CMP10 | Total number of complaints received (stage 1).                         | 410                 |                            | 377                  | Indicative only            |  | Cumulative. Measures the number of new complaints relating to each service area at the first stage.             |

| Reference   | Performance Indicator                            | 2011-12 End of year | LAPS Bench mark 2011-12 Q3 | 2012-13 Year to date | 2012-13 Current YTD Target | Alert | Definition  |
|-------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-------|---|
| Local CMP11 | Total number of complaints escalated to stage 2. | 36                  |                            | 15                   | Indicative only            | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the number of complaints over the year that were not resolved at stage 1 and escalated to stage 2. |

| Comments  |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NI 191, NI 192 and Tonnes of Waste Land Filled: reported a quarter in arrears</li> <li>YTD values (Q1 and Q2) for fly tipping indicators were revised in December 2012 following a data audit/verification process for each of the indicators reported</li> <li>Active library borrowers indicator has been replaced with active library users as this is more reflective of the way libraries are now being used, online etc. The target for active library users will be revised at the start of the new financial year to reflect the increase in population in Brent as per the 2011 census.</li> <li>Complaints: The highest complaint areas were Recycling &amp; Waste and Safer Streets.</li> </ul> |

# REGENERATION & MAJOR PROJECTS











| Reference | Performance Indicator  | 2011-12 End of year | LAPS Bench mark 2011-12 Q3    | 2012-13 Year to date | 2012-13 Current YTD Target | Alert   | Definition  |
|-----------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| NI 154    | Net additional homes provided  | 559                 | 604.9 (12 returns inc. Brent) | Annual               | 915                        |    | Cumulative: Measures the number of additional homes provided  |
| NI 157a   | Percentage of major Planning applications processed within 13 weeks.         | 41%                 | 47.1%                         | 62.5%                | 70%                        |    | Measures the efficiency of the Planning applications process.   |
| NI 157b   | Percentage of minor Planning applications processed within 8 weeks.          | 67%                 | 70.9%                         | 78%                  | 80%                        |    | Measures the efficiency of the Planning applications process.   |
| NI 157c   | Percentage of other Planning applications processed within 8 weeks.          | 81%                 | 81.8%                         | 83%                  | 90%                        |   | Measures the efficiency of the Planning applications process.   |
| Local     | Percentage of working age residents in employment                            | 64.2%               | 68.1%                         | 64.1%                | Indicative only            |  | Measures the percentage of eligible age residents who are currently employed.                                     |
| Local     | Gap between Brent and London for working age people on out of work benefits. | 3.45%               | 3.3%                          | 3.7%                 | Indicative only            |  | Measures how Brent's cohort of working age people on out of work benefits compares to the London average figures. |
| NI 156    | Number of households living in Temporary Accommodation.                      | 3176                | 1173.4                        | 3220                 | 3600                       |  | Cumulative. Measures the number of households in temporary accommodation provided under Homelessness legislation. |
| Local     | Percentage of residents with no qualifications                               | -4.8%               |                               | 1.9%                 | Indicative only            |  | Latest. Measures the percentage gap between Brent and London average. Minus figure reflects higher than average.  |
| Local     | Percentage of empty commercial properties in the borough                     | 14.99%              |                               | 13.21%               | Indicative only            |  | Latest. Percentage of total commercial properties which remain unoccupied.  |

| Reference                              | Performance Indicator  | 2011-12 End of year | LAPS Bench mark 2011-12 Q3 | 2012-13 Year to date | 2012-13 Current YTD Target | Alert   | Definition  |
|--|--|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| Local                                  | Current rent collection rate as a percentage of total rent due (excl. arrears) | 99.1%               |                            | 98.4%                | 98%                        |    | Latest. Percentage of rent collected by the Council as a proportion owed by Housing Revenue Account dwellings.          |
| Local                                  | Average days taken to re-let Council properties                                | 27                  |                            | 19.72                | 20                         |    | Measures the average number of days taken to re-let Council properties.   |
| Local                                  | Percentage of repairs completed on the first visit.                            | 95%                 |                            | 96.85%               | 95%                        |    | Measures the efficiency of the Housing Repairs system.  |
| Local CMP10                            | Total number of complaints received (Local Resolution).                        | 281                 |                            | 212                  | Indicative only            |    | Cumulative. Measures the number of new complaints relating to each service area at the first stage.                     |
| Local CMP11                            | Total number of final review complaints received                               | 47                  |                            | 26                   | Indicative only            |    | Cumulative. Measures the number of complaints over the year that were not resolved at stage 1 and escalated to stage 2. |
| <b>Brent Housing Partnership (BHP)</b> |  |                     |                            |                      |                            |   |   |
| Local CMP10                            | Total number of complaints received (stage 1).                                 | 540                 |                            | 307                  | Indicative only            |  | Cumulative. Measures the number of new complaints relating to each service area at the first stage.                     |
| Local CMP11                            | Total number of complaints escalated to stage 2.                               | 74                  |                            | 32                   | Indicative only            |  | Cumulative. Measures the number of complaints over the year that were not resolved at stage 1 and escalated to stage 2. |

## Comments

- NI 154 - There will be no firm information on the number of new homes provided until after the end of the financial year when a completions survey is undertaken. The assessment of progress is based upon an estimate of the level of devt. Activity
- NI 157a – Performance against the major applications target (NI 157a) is the most vulnerable to external factors and will be a key indicator for the Government's proposal to remove planning powers from authorities who fail to meet national performance targets (which are below Brent targets).
- NI 157 (a, b &c) - All three applications that went over the target time were Brent related schemes which were reported to the Planning Committee within target. Two overran due to delays satisfying the Major of London and the other related to a sale of Council property. It is recommended that this success factor is included in the programming of future corporate planning applications and that Planning Performance Agreements are included to formally vary the target timescale.
- Proportion of residents with no qualifications: Remains the same as last quarter. There has been a massive reversal of the proportion of residents with no qualifications; the rate has increased by more than 100%. The previous years (Jan 10-Dec 10) data jumped from 5.1% to 11.2% (Jan 11-Dec 11)
- Planning Complaints constant with 10 local resolutions and one final review for this reporting period. The reporting method on response time was changed from a percentage to show case numbers, based on the total sent and the total sent in time. The complaints service is continuing to work with the department to improve response times.
- Housing complaints are comparable with previous quarters and with clients wanting to improve their banding in being able to acquire permanent accommodation. There has been a general rise in demand through the homeless route as welfare cuts start to bite. Also increased correspondence concerning clients looking for permanent accommodation through the waiting list and enquiries about affordability of housing. Following the recent restructure, there has been a big increase in correspondence from clients in temporary accommodation which is presently being addressed in the current restructure.

# CENTRAL SERVICES

















| Reference   | Performance Indicator  | 2011-12 End of year | LAPS Bench mark 2011-12 Q3 | 2012-13 Year to date | 2012-13 Current YTD Target  | Alert   | Definition   |
|---|--|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Local   | Violence with Injury Offences                                    | 2662                | -                          | 1771                 | 2529 (Annual)<br>1896 (YTD) |    | Measures the cumulative number of violence with injury offences.   |
| Local   | Number of Motor vehicle Crime Offences.                          | 3322                | -                          | 2063                 | 3056 (Annual)<br>2292 (YTD) |    | Measures the number of motor vehicle crime offences (of and from) recorded by the police.  |
| Local   | Number of Personal Robberies: cumulative rolling financial year. | 5758                |                            | 1115                 | 1866 (Annual)<br>1340 (YTD) |    | Cumulative. Measures the number of personal robberies  |
| Local   | Number of Residential Burglaries: cumulative                     | 7663                |                            | 2012                 | 2879 (Annual)<br>2159 (YTD) |    | Cumulative. Measures the number of residential burglaries  |
| NI 181  | Time taken to process all Benefit claims.                        | 8.19                | -                          | 8.19                 | 8.00                        |  | Measures the average number of days taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit claims and change events.                   |
| Local   | Council Tax collection rates.                                    | 96.02%              | 82.4%                      | 84.73%               | 96.20% (Annual)             |  | Cumulative. Percentage. Measures Council Tax collected as an amount against the net debit raised at the start of the financial year. |
| NI 185  | Volume of CO2 emissions from council main buildings.             | 2.76m               |                            | 1.99m                | Indicative only             |  | Cumulative. Measures the amount of CO2 emissions in tonnes from Mahatma Gandhi House, Brent House and Town Hall.                     |
| Local   | Average number of working days lost due to sickness absence.     | 5.34                | 7.4                        | 0.9                  | Indicative only             |  | Measures the average number of days lost across the Council due to sickness absence.   |
| Complaints: Strategy partnerships and improvement |  |                     |                            |                      |                             |   |  |
| Local CMP10                                       | Total number of complaints received (stage 1).                   | 0                   |                            | 0                    | Indicative only             |  | Cumulative. Measures the number of new complaints relating to each service area at the first stage.                                  |
| Local CMP11                                       | Total number of complaints escalated to stage 2.                 | 0                   |                            | 0                    | Indicative only             |  | Cumulative. Measures the number of complaints over the year that were not resolved at stage 1 and escalated to stage 2.              |

| Reference                                     | Performance Indicator                            | 2011-12 End of year | LAPS Bench mark 2011-12 Q3 | 2012-13 Year to date | 2012-13 Current YTD Target | Alert | Definition  |
|---|--|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-------|---|
| Complaints: Customer and community engagement |  |                     |                            |                      |                            |       |   |
| Local CMP10                                   | Total number of complaints received (stage 1).   | 37                  |                            | 10                   | Indicative only            | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the number of new complaints relating to each service area at the first stage.                     |
| Local CMP11                                   | Total number of complaints escalated to stage 2. | 0                   |                            | 0                    | Indicative only            | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the number of complaints over the year that were not resolved at stage 1 and escalated to stage 2. |
| Complaints: Finance and corporate services    |  |                     |                            |                      |                            |       |   |
| Local CMP10                                   | Total number of complaints received (stage 1).   | 221                 |                            | 26                   | Indicative only            | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the number of new complaints relating to each service area at the first stage.                     |
| Local CMP11                                   | Total number of complaints escalated to stage 2. | 16                  |                            | 5                    | Indicative only            | ●     | Cumulative. Measures the number of complaints over the year that were not resolved at stage 1 and escalated to stage 2. |

| Comments   |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NI 15 (serious violent crime) and NI 16 (serious acquisitive crime rate) these indicators are no longer collected by the MET Police in the same way and therefore a statistical comparison is unavailable, and data would be unreliable. We have therefore replaced these indicators with Violence with Injury offences and Motor Vehicle Crime (of and from).</li> <li>Residential Burglary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 2012/2013 burglary reduction target is to reduce residential burglary by 6%.</li> <li>b. Police YTD figures as at 14 January 2013 show a 7.4% reduction compared to the same period in 2011/2012. This is 2280 residential burglaries in 2011/12 compared to 2112 residential burglaries in 2012/2013 – 168 less residential burglaries.</li> <li>c. Sanction detection rate set for 2012/13 is 12%. Police YTD figures as at 14 January 2013 show a 19.9% sanction detection rate achieved compared to 15% sanction detection rate achieved for the same period in 2011/12.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Personal Robbery – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 2012/2013 Brent MPS target is to achieve 11% reduction compared to the previous year (2011/12). This target has been exceeded.</li> <li>b. Police YTD figures as at 14 January 2013 show a 30.9% reduction (513 less incidents) achieved compared to the same period in 2011/2012.</li> <li>c. The sanction detection rate target for 2012/2013 is 18%.</li> <li>d. Police YTD figures as at 14 January 2013 show a 15.2% SD rate compared to 13.6% for 2011/2012. Although we have exceeded last years SD rate for the same period, we are still below the target of 18%.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Registration and Nationality's (part of Customer and Community Engagement) complaints are not currently being recorded as part of the Council's complaints procedure.</li> </ul> |  |



# One Council Programme Quarterly Snapshot Position















| PROJECT NAME  | PROJECT SPONSOR   | PROJECT STAGE               | RAG STATUS  |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Projects in Delivery and Reporting into the OC Programme (16)</b>  |                   |                             |   |
| 1. Web Enhancement  | Toni McConville   | Delivery                    |    |
| 2. Digital Post Room  | Margaret Read     | Delivery                    |    |
| 3. Civic Centre (including Move to the Civic Centre)  | Andy Donald       | Delivery                    |    |
| 4. Project Athena: E-business suite   | Andy Donald       | Delivery                    |    |
| 5. Realigning Corporate and Business Support  | Christine Gilbert | Delivery                    |    |
| 6. Procurement (Training and Practice / E-Procurement / Additional Operational Savings from Procurement Activities) | Fiona Ledden      | Delivery                    |    |
| 7. Special Educational Needs (SEN) Review: Phase 2  | Sara Williams     | Delivery                    |    |
| 8. Libraries Transformation   | Jenny Isaac       | Delivery                    |    |
| 9. Parking Enforcement Review   | Michael Read      | Delivery                    |    |
| 10. Highways  | Jenny Isaac       | Delivery                    |    |
| 11. Managing the Public Realm   | Jenny Isaac       | Delivery                    |    |
| 12. Improving Waste Management  | Michael Read      | Delivery                    |   |
| 13. Adult Social Care - Direct Services (Learning Disabilities)   | Alison Elliott    | Delivery                    |  |
| 14. Supporting People Phase 1   | Steven Forbes     | Delivery                    |  |
| 15. Developing a Model for Public Health in Brent   | Phil Newby        | Delivery                    |  |
| 16. Working with Families Phase 2   | Phil Newby        | Delivery                    |  |
| <b>Other Projects (not reporting directly into the OC Programme) (5)</b>  |                   |                             |   |
| 1. Customer & Visitor Management (CC Operations)  | Margaret Read     | Delivery - new              |   |
| 2. Review of Employee Benefits  | Phil Newby        | Delivery – PSR not required |   |
| 3. Services for Young People (Phase 1)  | Cathy Tyson       | Delivery – PSR not required | N/a   |
| 4. Review of School Improvement Service   | Sara Williams     | Delivery- PSR not required  | N/a   |
| 5. Working with Families Phase1   | Phil Newby        | Delivery – PSR not required | N/a   |
| <b>Planned Projects (at the pre-Delivery stage) (1)</b>   |                   |                             |   |
| 1. Integrating Health and Social Care   | Alison Elliott    | Pre-delivery (6mths +)      | N/a   |
| <b>Completed Projects (15)</b>  |                   |                             |   |
| 1. Finance Modernisation Project  |                   | Closed                      | N/a - closed  |
| 2. Income Maximisation  |                   | Closed                      | N/a - closed  |
| 3. Staffing & Structure Review Wave 1   |                   | Closed                      | N/a - closed  |
| 4. Staffing & Structure Review Wave 2   |                   | Closed                      | N/a - closed  |
| 5. Temporary Labour Project   | Fiona Ledden      | Closed                      | N/a - closed  |
| 6. Strategic Procurement Review   | Fiona Ledden      | Closed                      | N/a - closed  |
| 7. Future Customer Service  | Toni McConville   | Closed                      | N/a - closed  |
| 8. Transitions into Adult Life  | Alison Elliott    | Closed                      | N/a - closed  |



| PROJECT NAME                              | PROJECT SPONSOR | PROJECT STAGE | RAG STATUS   |
|---|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Completed Projects (15 continued)</b>  |                 |               |              |
| 9. SEN Review Phase 1                     | Krutika Pau     | Closed        | N/a - closed |
| 10. Children's Social Care Transformation | Krutika Pau     | Closed        | N/a - closed |
| 11. Children with Disabilities            | Graham Genoni   | Closed        | N/a - closed |
| 12. Waste & Street Cleansing Review       | Sue Harper      | Closed        | N/a - closed |
| 13. Adult Social Care: Customer Journey   | Alison Elliott  | Closed        | N/a - closed |
| 14. Adult Social Care Commissioning       | Alison Elliott  | Closed        | N/a - closed |
| 15. Housing Needs Transformation          | Andy Donald     | Closed        | N/a - closed |


**Performance and Finance Review**

# **Finance Report**

# ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES

| Budget: GENERAL FUND      |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| Adult Social Services     |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
| Unit                      | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
| <b><u>Operational</u></b> |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
| Directorate               | 1,743                        | 5,571                      | 5,447                        | (124)                                  |    |
| Voluntary Sector          | 1,344                        | 0                          | 4                            | 4                                      |    |
| Reablement & Safeguarding | 3,011                        | 3,539                      | 3,306                        | (233)                                  |    |
| Support Planning & Review | 3,450                        | 3,870                      | 3,835                        | (35)                                   |    |
| Day Centres               | 6,946                        | 5,456                      | 5,420                        | (36)                                   |    |
| Client Services           | 14,557                       | 15,367                     | 15,343                       | (24)                                   |    |
| <b>Total Operational</b>  | <b>31,051</b>                | <b>33,803</b>              | <b>33,355</b>                | <b>(448)</b>                           |  |
| <b><u>Purchasing</u></b>  |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
| Older People's Services   | 23,833                       | 21,669                     | 21,650                       | (19)                                   |  |
| Learning & Disability     | 18,487                       | 15,396                     | 15,362                       | (34)                                   |  |
| Mental Health             | 7,351                        | 7,467                      | 7,453                        | (14)                                   |  |
| Physical Disability       | 8,223                        | 7,180                      | 7,145                        | (35)                                   |  |
| Transitions               | 0                            | 5,513                      | 6,149                        | 636                                    |  |
| <b>Total Purchasing</b>   | <b>57,894</b>                | <b>57,225</b>              | <b>57,759</b>                | <b>534</b>                             |  |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>88,945</b>                | <b>91,028</b>              | <b>91,114</b>                | <b>86</b>                              |  |

| Budget: CAPITAL            |                              |  |                              |  |   |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|---|
| Unit                       | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Proposed<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
| Adults: Individual schemes | 0                            | 0                                      | 0                            | 0                                      |  |
| Ring-fenced grant          |                              |  |                              |  |  |

|                              |            |              |              |  |          |   |
|------------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--|----------|---|
| notifications for adult care | 300        | 1,532        | 1,532        |  | 0        |   |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>300</b> | <b>1,532</b> | <b>1,532</b> |  | <b>0</b> |  |

### Key Financial Risks

#### **Adult Social Services Revenue**






Current forecasts are that the outturn overspend will reduce to £86k, some £452k less than the forecast of £538k at quarter 2. The department is working hard to identify new areas to bring this down further, so that at year end it hopes to have a balanced budget position. The financial pressure in 2012/13 relates to the shortfall in funding for transitions over the last two financial years, a pressure of £1m and the department has worked continuously to reduce this with compensating underspends in other areas of the budget such as:



- Keeping vacancies unfilled and not recruiting agency staff.
- On off top slicing of grants to voluntary organisations in relation to care services and HIV/Aids services.
- Additional agreement on capitalisation of occupational therapy costs.
- Agreement from the PCT for funding of staff costs for the memory clinic and for historic rent and service charges

#### **Adult Social Services Capital**

£20k of budget and grant has been transferred to Regeneration and Major Projects to fund the work at the John Billam Resource Centre.

# CHILDREN & FAMILIES

| Budget: GENERAL FUND                   |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| Children and Families                  |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
| Unit                                   | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
| Achievement & Inclusion                | 46,718                       | 47,065                     | 46,765                       | (300)                                  |  |
| Social Care                            | 37,550                       | 32,923                     | 33,774                       | 851                                    |  |
| Central Support & Other                | 1,734                        | 1,075                      | 574                          | (501)                                  |  |
| Schools and Dedicated<br>School Grants | (32,887)                     | (34,810)                   | (34,810)                     | 0                                      |  |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>53,115</b>                | <b>46,253</b>              | <b>46,303</b>                | <b>50</b>                              |  |

| Budget: CAPITAL              |                              |  |                              |  |   |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|---|
| Unit                         | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Proposed<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
| Increasing nursery provision | 0                            | 883                                    | 883                          | 0                                      |  |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>0</b>                     | <b>883</b>                             | <b>883</b>                   | <b>0</b>                               |  |

## Key Financial Risks

### Children and Families Revenue

The service area is currently forecasting an overspend of £50k, a change of £38k on the £12k overspend reported in quarter 2. There continue to be pressures on the children's social care purchasing and placement budget although steps have been taken during the year to reduce these costs.

- Following a successful legal challenge by a number of local authorities on the basis of how monies were being deducted for academy funding for LACSEG as part of the local government finance settlement the authority received £500k compensation.
- Lower than expected redundancy costs following the review of Early Years has resulted in £200k of additional savings.
- Savings from Transport and Business Support are both contributing £150k of savings each.
- The above savings have allowed the pressures on the Social Care purchasing and placements

### Key Financial Risks

budget to be balanced.

The schools budget is currently forecasting an overspend of £182k which is a £386k improvement on the £568k reported in quarter 2. There are two main elements of overspending

- £1m estimated overspend in SEN mainly in out of borough Mainstream & Independent Day Special pupils.
- Pupils without school places is currently forecasting an overspend of £1.062m with a significant increase since August because of the new September 2012 intake of pupils.

These overspends are offset by





- £1.4m from the schools budget headroom which was approved as part of the schools budget deficit recovery plan.
- The review of the Alternative Education Services has achieved savings of £300k from the closure of one of the Pupil Referral Units.
- £100k savings from Schools Improvement Service











The current forecast is subject to further review once the final Dedicated Schools Grant allocation for 2012/13 has been announced by the DfE and a firmer forecast should be available at that point.

### **Children and Families Capital**

Children and Families has an additional grant, which is being used to increase private, voluntary and independent nursery provision


# ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

| Budget: GENERAL FUND                   |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| Environment and Neighbourhood Services |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
| Unit                                   | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
| Directorate                            | 844                          | 849                        | 820                          | (29)                                   |  |
| Neighbourhood Services                 | 9,172                        | 9,129                      | 9,080                        | (49)                                   |  |
| Environment & Protection               | 26,632                       | 24,118                     | 24,664                       | 546                                    |  |
|  |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>36,648</b>                | <b>34,096</b>              | <b>34,564</b>                | <b>468</b>                             |  |

| Budget: CAPITAL                  |                              |  |                              |  |   |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|---|
| Unit                             | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Proposed<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
| TfL grant funded schemes         | 4,179                        | 4,222                                  | 4,222                        | 0                                      |  |
| Estate Access Corridor           | 593                          | 1,201                                  | 1,201                        | 0                                      |  |
| Stadium Access Corridor          | 0                            | 30                                     | 30                           | 0                                      |  |
| Leisure & Sports schemes         | 643                          | 1,247                                  | 1,247                        | 0                                      |  |
| Environmental Initiative schemes | 3,389                        | 2                                      | 2                            | 0                                      |  |
| Public Realm                     | 0                            | 4,347                                  | 4,347                        | 0                                      |  |
| Highways schemes                 | 5,081                        | 3,575                                  | 3,575                        | 0                                      |  |
| Parks & Cemeteries schemes       | 483                          | 912                                    | 912                          | 0                                      |  |
| Library schemes                  | 0                            | 100                                    | 100                          | 0                                      |  |
| S106 works                       | 0                            | 0                                      | 0                            | 0                                      |  |



## Budget: CAPITAL

| Unit   | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Proposed<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
|--|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|---|
| Total Environment & Neighbourhoods Capital Programme | 14,368                       | 15,636                                 | 15,636                       | 0                                      |  |

## Key Financial Risks














### Environment and Neighbourhood Services Revenue




Environment and Neighbourhoods is currently forecasting an overspend of £468k for 2012/13. The projected tonnages on waste and recycling have increased since quarter 2 and current forecasts are for a £796k overspend predominantly around higher than anticipated tonnages for residual waste to landfill. There continue to be issues over staffing costs following the wave 2 staffing and structure review and a shortfall in highways and licensing income. To meet the overspend £443k of balance sheet deposits and provisions no longer required will be written back. Negotiations are also taking place with Veolia to achieve lower gate fees, a reduction in vehicle costs and a review of rounds. Action is also being taken to review agency and freeze vacant posts and non essential spend. Overall the position is £316k worse than quarter 2.

### Environment and Neighbourhood Services Capital




The budget for the public realm has been reduced by £1,853k to reflect savings on the purchase costs of the depot.

# REGENERATION & MAJOR PROJECTS









| Budget: GENERAL FUND                         |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| Housing                                      |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
| Unit   | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
| Housing Benefit Deficit                      | 710                          | 1,134                      | 944                          | (190)                                  |    |
| Housing Needs                                | 8,514                        | 7,114                      | 6,443                        | (671)                                  |    |
| Private Housing Services                     | 710                          | 727                        | 727                          | 0                                      |    |
| Supporting People                            | 10,383                       | 9,953                      | 9,677                        | (276)                                  |    |
| Other Housing Services                       | 604                          | 295                        | 432                          | 137                                    |    |
| <b>Total</b>                                 | <b>20,921</b>                | <b>19,223</b>              | <b>18,223</b>                | <b>(1,000)</b>                         |    |
| Non Housing                                  |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
| Unit   | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
| Civic Centre & Major Projects                | 436                          | 3,188                      | 3,188                        | 0                                      |  |
| Directorate & Business Support               | 516                          | 487                        | 487                          | 0                                      |  |
| Planning & Building Control                  | 1,330                        | 1,022                      | 1,022                        | 0                                      |  |
| Policy & Regeneration                        | 126                          | 478                        | 478                          | 0                                      |  |
| Property & Asset Management                  | 9,778                        | 9,112                      | 9,112                        | 0                                      |  |
| <b>Total</b>                                 | <b>12,186</b>                | <b>14,287</b>              | <b>14,287</b>                | <b>0</b>                               |  |
| <b>Total Regeneration and Major Projects</b> | <b>33,107</b>                | <b>33,510</b>              | <b>32,510</b>                | <b>(1,000)</b>                         |  |

| Budget: CAPITAL             |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| Housing                     | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
| PSRSG & DFG Council         | 4,169                        | 6,030                      | 6,030                        | 0                                      |  |
| HCA Empty Home programme    | 0                            | 288                        | 288                          | 0                                      |   |
| New units                   | 0                            | 0                          | 0                            | 0                                      |  |
| Housing: Individual schemes | 115                          | 527                        | 527                          | 0                                      |  |




### Budget: CAPITAL











| Housing  | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, |  | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over<br>Spend £000, | Alert   |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Right to buy administration costs                      | 34                           | 0                          | 0                            |  | 0                                      |  |
| <b>Total Housing Capital Programme</b>                 | <b>4,318</b>                 | <b>6,845</b>               | <b>6,845</b>                 |  | <b>0</b>                               |  |
| <b>Total Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme</b> | <b>10,835</b>                | <b>12,523</b>              | <b>12,523</b>                |  | <b>0</b>                               |  |

### Budget: CAPITAL

| Regeneration & Major Projects                                  | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Proposed<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, |  | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over<br>Spend £000, | Alert   |
|--|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Civic Centre   | 34,042                       | 56,033                                 | 56,033                       |  | 0                                      |    |
| Children & Families  | 47,139                       | 59,733                                 | 59,733                       |  | 0                                      |   |
| Culture  | (57)                         | 0                                      | 0                            |  | 0                                      |  |
| Adults & Social Care   | 0                            | 0                                      | 0                            |  | 0                                      |  |
| Housing  | 0                            | 0                                      | 0                            |  | 0                                      |  |
| Strategy, Partnership and Improvement                          | 8,935                        | 25,127                                 | 25,127                       |  | 0                                      |  |
| S106 Works   | 0                            | 13,678                                 | 13,678                       |  | 0                                      |  |
| <b>Total Regeneration and Major Projects Capital Programme</b> | <b>90,059</b>                | <b>154,571</b>                         | <b>154,571</b>               |  | <b>0</b>                               |  |

### Budget

| Housing Revenue Account (HRA) | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, |  | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Rent and Rates                | 1,459                        | 1,759                      | 1,759                        |  | 0                                      |  |
| Capital Financing             | 19,946                       | 11,456                     | 11,456                       |  | 0                                      |  |
| Depreciation (MRA)            | 8,078                        | 13,720                     | 13,261                       |  | (459)                                  |  |

|                                     |                |              |                |          |   |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------|---|
| General/Special Management/Services | 15,005         | 17,202       | 16,654         | (548)    |  |
| Housing Repairs                     | 11,018         | 11,467       | 11,467         | 0        |  |
| Provision for Bad Debts             | 736            | 658          | 658            | 0        |  |
| HRA Subsidy                         | (8,000)        | 0            | 0              | 0        |  |
| Rent & Service Charge Income        | (47,498)       | (53,638)     | (52,631)       | 1,007    |  |
| Other Income                        | (641)          | (438)        | (438)          | 0        |  |
| Transfer to/(from) Reserves         | (676)          | (1,890)      | (1,890)        | 0        |  |
| <b>Total</b>                        | <b>(573)</b>   | <b>296</b>   | <b>296</b>     | <b>0</b> |  |
| Balances b/fwd                      | (1,695)        | (696)        | (2,268)        | 0        |  |
| Surplus c/fwd                       | <b>(2,268)</b> | <b>(400)</b> | <b>(1,972)</b> | <b>0</b> |  |

### Key Financial Risks

#### Regeneration and Major Projects Revenue

Regeneration and Major Projects are now forecasting an underspend of £1m an improvement from the £500k underspend reported in quarter 2

The main pressure within Regeneration and Major Projects was envisaged at the start of the year to be the housing benefit scheme changes resulting from the introduction of the Local Housing Allowance caps in April 2011. Temporary Accommodation budget includes growth of £1.134m in order to assist in managing the cost pressures and increased service demand. The pressures on the temporary accommodation and housing benefit budgets are not as high as projected and it is currently showing an underspend of £861k in total. It is proposed that expected surplus on Regeneration & Major Projects for 2012/13 will be set aside in a reserve to help meet the additional temporary accommodation pressures in 2013/14.

#### Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Revenue

The HRA forecast is currently in line with budget.

#### Regeneration and Major Projects Capital

Within the Children and Families capital programme, there are a number of changes. £8k has been vired from the Schools Asset Management Plan to Access Initiatives; and £104k has been vired from Schools

### Key Financial Risks

Asset Management Plan to the Provision for Temporary School Expansion. The project at Islamia has slipped from this year, reducing forecast expenditure by £2,932k. Expenditure on school expansion schemes has been rephased, and in the current year forecast expenditure has decreased by £1,781k at Barham Park, £1,328k at Mitchell Brook Primary, and £2,577k at Fryent Primary School. £167k has been added to the schools expansion programme funded by surplus capital receipts. £47,436k of grant allocated to expansion schemes has been slipped to future years. £170k of Short Breaks for Disabled Children grant has been received, but not allocated to a scheme.

The Strategy, Partnership and Improvement schemes include a reduction in forecast expenditure of £2,816k this year for South Kilburn Regeneration due to a revised cashflow. A transfer of £20k of grant for John Billam from Adult Social Services. New spending of £340k on Public Conveniences in the Wembley Area is funded by £308k of Section 106, with the balance funded from revenue.







#### **Housing General Fund Capital**







£1,800k of spending on Private Sector Renewal Support Grant and Disabled Facilities Grant council has been slipped to 2013-14. £288k of additional funding has been received from the HCA.

#### **Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital**

Rooftop Aerials to Housing Blocks has slipped by £560k; Health & Safety Works in South Kilburn has slipped by £530k; Health & Safety Works to Housing Blocks has slipped by £1,1730k; Loft Conversions has slipped by £50k; Major Repairs Allowance Works has slipped by £4m; an additional £122k compulsory purchase order has been funded by Notting Hill Housing Association.

# CENTRAL SERVICES

| Budget: GENERAL FUND                   |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| Central Services                       |                              |                            |                              |  |   |
| Unit                                   | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
| Chief Executive's Office               | 487                          | 481                        | 481                          | 0                                      |  |
| Customer & Community Engagement        | 3,577                        | 3,777                      | 3,777                        | 0                                      |  |
| Legal and Procurement                  | 1,245                        | 5,025                      | 5,025                        | 0                                      |  |
| Finance & Corporate Services           | 21,150                       | 21,984                     | 21,984                       | 0                                      |  |
| Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement | 4,554                        | 6,298                      | 6,029                        | (269)                                  |  |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>31,013</b>                | <b>37,565</b>              | <b>37,296</b>                | <b>(269)</b>                           |  |

| Budget: CAPITAL                                |                              |  |                              |  |   |
|--|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|---|
| Unit   | 2011/12<br>Out-turn<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Proposed<br>Budget<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>Forecast<br>£000, | 2012/13<br>(Under)/Over Spend<br>£000, | Alert   |
| ICT schemes                                    | 1,780                        | 1,619                                  | 1,619                        | 0                                      |  |
| Property schemes                               | 0                            | 0                                      | 0                            | 0                                      |  |
| Strategy, Partnerships and Improvement Schemes | 0                            | 0                                      | 0                            | 0                                      |  |
| Central Items                                  | 2,765                        | 2,319                                  | 2,319                        | 0                                      |  |
| S106 works                                     | 0                            | 0                                      | 0                            | 0                                      |  |
| <b>Total Corporate Capital Programme</b>       | <b>4,545</b>                 | <b>3,938</b>                           | <b>3,938</b>                 | <b>0</b>                               |  |

## Key Financial Risks

### Central Services Revenue

The forecast outturn position remains unchanged from the quarter 2 position of a £269k underspend. This covers an underspend on vacant posts in the policy area of Strategy, Performance & Improvement. It is anticipated that by year end there will be further underspends in Strategy, Performance & Improvement




























### Key Financial Risks

and potentially within the Chief Executive's Office.

#### **Central Services Capital**

The has been no change from the Quarter 2 budget.

# SUMMARY

| Overall Summary      |  |                             |                           |                   |                   |   |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|
|                      |  | Original<br>Budget<br>£000, | Latest<br>Budget<br>£000, | Forecast<br>£000, | Variance<br>£000, | Alert   |
| Departmental Budgets |  |                             |                           |                   |                   |   |
|                      | Adult Social Services                                    | 87,552                      | 91,028                    | 91,114            | 86                |    |
|                      | Children and Families                                    | 51,402                      | 46,253                    | 46,303            | 50                |    |
|                      | Environment and<br>Neighbourhood Services                | 34,073                      | 34,096                    | 34,564            | 468               |    |
|                      | Regeneration & Major<br>Projects                         | 33,277                      | 33,510                    | 32,510            | (1,000)           |    |
|                      | Central Services   | 32,550                      | 37,317                    | 37,048            | (269)             |    |
|                      | Transfer to Reserves                                     | 0                           | 0                         | 1,000             | 1,000             |   |
|                      | <b>Total</b>   | <b>240,854</b>              | <b>242,452</b>            | <b>242,787</b>    | <b>335</b>        |    |
| Central Items        |  |                             |                           |                   |                   |   |
|                      | Capital Financing and Other<br>Charges                   | 25,343                      | 25,343                    | 24,166            | (1,177)           |    |
|                      | Levies   | 2,579                       | 2,579                     | 3,129             | 550               |    |
|                      | Premature Retirement<br>Compensation                     | 5,416                       | 5,416                     | 5,266             | (150)             |   |
|                      | Insurance Fund   | 1,800                       | 1,800                     | 1,800             | 0                 |  |
|                      | New Homes Bonus  | (2,794)                     | (2,794)                   | (2,794)           | 0                 |  |
|                      | One Council Programme                                    | (734)                       | (69)                      | (69)              | 0                 |  |
|                      | Remuneration Strategy                                    | 229                         | 229                       | 229               | 0                 |  |
|                      | South Kilburn Development                                | 900                         | 900                       | 900               | 0                 |  |
|                      | Affordable Housing PFI                                   | 1,288                       | 0                         | 0                 | 0                 |  |
|                      | Carbon Tax   | 304                         | 304                       | 67                | (237)             |  |
|                      | Redundancy &<br>Restructuring Costs                      | 4,354                       | 4,354                     | 4,354             | 0                 |  |
|                      | Inflation Provision                                      | 2,025                       | 1,050                     | 1,050             | 0                 |  |
|                      | Council Tax Freeze Grant                                 | (2,575)                     | (2,575)                   | (2,605)           | (30)              |  |
|                      | Government Grants  | (24,638)                    | (24,638)                  | (24,654)          | (16)              |  |
|                      | Transformation Enabling<br>Fund                          | 3,500                       | 3,500                     | 3,500             | 0                 |  |
|                      | Other Items  | 1,541                       | 1,541                     | 1,541             | 0                 |  |
|                      | <b>Total central items</b>                               | <b>18,538</b>               | <b>16,940</b>             | <b>15,880</b>     | <b>(1,060)</b>    |  |
|                      | Contribution to/(from)<br>balances                       | 1,000                       | 1,000                     | 1,725             | 725               |  |
|                      | <b>Total Budget Requirement</b>                          | <b>260,392</b>              | <b>260,392</b>            | <b>260,392</b>    | <b>0</b>          |   |
|                      |  |                             |                           |                   |                   |   |
|                      | Balances c/Fwd 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2012                | 10,080                      | 10,080                    | 10,316            | 236               |  |
|                      | Contribution from balances                               | 1,000                       | 1,000                     | 1,725             | 725               |  |
|                      | <b>Total Balances for 31<sup>st</sup> March<br/>2013</b> | <b>11,080</b>               | <b>11,080</b>             | <b>12,041</b>     | <b>961</b>        |  |



## Capital Programme Virement and Adjustment Schedule 2012/13

|  | Adult Social Services<br>£000, | Environment & Neighbourhood Services<br>£000, | Regeneration & Major Projects<br>£000, | Central Services<br>£000, | Finance & Corporate Services<br>£000, | Children & Families<br>£000 | Total General Fund<br>£000, | Housing Revenue Account<br>£000, |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. John Billam                         | (20)                           |   | 20                                     |                           |                                       |                             | 0                           |                                  |
| 2. Increasing Nursery Provision        |                                |   |  |                           |                                       | 883                         | 883                         |                                  |
| 3. Public Realm                        |                                | (1,853)                                       |  |                           |                                       |                             | (1,853)                     |                                  |
| 4. RMP Internal Virements              |                                |   | 0                                      |                           |                                       |                             | 0                           |                                  |
| 5. Islamia                             |                                |   | (2,932)                                |                           |                                       |                             | (2,932)                     |                                  |
| 6. Schools Expansion rephasing         |                                |   | (53,122)                               |                           |                                       |                             | (53,122)                    |                                  |
| 7. School Expansion additional funding |                                |   | 167                                    |                           |                                       |                             | 167                         |                                  |
| 8. Additional Short breaks funding     |                                |   | 170                                    |                           |                                       |                             | 170                         |                                  |
| 9. South Kilburn                       |                                |   | (2,816)                                |                           |                                       |                             | (2,816)                     |                                  |
| 10. Public Conveniences                |                                |   | 32                                     |                           |                                       |                             | 32                          |                                  |
| 11. PSRSG&DFG                          |                                |   | (1,800)                                |                           |                                       |                             | (1,800)                     |                                  |
| 12. HCA Grant                          |                                |   | 288                                    |                           |                                       |                             | 288                         |                                  |
| 13. HRA Slippage                       |                                |   |  |                           |                                       |                             | 0                           | (6,870)                          |
| 14. HRA CPO                            |                                |   |  |                           |                                       |                             | 0                           | 122                              |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>(20)</b>                    | <b>(1,853)</b>                                | <b>(59,993)</b>                        | <b>0</b>                  | <b>0</b>                              | <b>883</b>                  | <b>(60,983)</b>             | <b>(6,748)</b>                   |

1. John Billam Resource centre - £20k of grant funding has been transferred from Adult Social Services to Regeneration and Major Projects for this project
2. Children and Families has received £883k grant to be spent on increasing Private, Voluntary and Independent Nursery provision
3. The budget for the public realm has been reduced by £1,853k reflecting savings on the purchase costs of the depot.
4. There are several virements with the Children and Families capital programme. £8k has been vired from the Schools Asset Management Plan to Access Initiatives; and £104k has been vired from Schools Asset Management Plan to the Provision for Temporary School Expansion.
5. The project at Islamia has slipped from this year, reducing forecast expenditure by £2,932k.
6. Expenditure on school expansion schemes has been rephased, and in the current year forecast expenditure has decreased by £1,781k at Barham Park, £1,328k at Mitchell Brook Primary, and

£2,577k at Fryent Primary School. In addition, £47,436k of grant allocated to expansion schemes has been slipped to future years.

7. £167k has been added to the schools expansion programme funded by surplus capital receipts.
8. £170k of Short Breaks for Disabled Children grant has been received, but not allocated to a scheme.
9. £2,816k reduction in spending at South Kilburn Regeneration is due to a revised cashflow.
10. £32k of revenue contribution towards Public Conveniences in the Wembley Area is supplemented by £308k of Section 106.
11. £1,800k of spending on Private Sector Renewal Support Grant and Disabled Facilities Grant council has been slipped to 2013-14.
12. £288k of additional funding has been received from the HCA.
13. Rooftop Aerials to Housing Blocks has slipped by £560k; Health & Safety Works in South Kilburn has slipped by £530k; Health & Safety Works to Housing Blocks has slipped by £1,1730k; Loft Conversions has slipped by £50k; Major Repairs Allowance Works has slipped by £4m
14. £122k compulsory purchase order has been funded by Notting Hill Housing Association.

**One Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2012/13**  
**Chair Cllr Ashraf**

| Date of Meeting            | Agenda Item   | Requested information/evidence   | Invited witnesses                          | Notes  |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 12 <sup>th</sup> June 2012 | <b>The waste and recycling transformation project</b> | Report back on the implementation of the waste management project and successes. .                         | <b>Chris Whyte &amp; David Pietropaoli</b> | Report was noted by the committee. Feedback requested about the collection of disused green boxes and engagement with landlords about tenants dumping rubbish. Template/guidance requested regarding the promotion of the free bulky waste collection service. Feedback will be circulated to all committee members. |
|                            | <b>Services for young people project</b>              | Update to be provided on how the project is going.   | <b>Cathy Tyson</b>                         | Update was noted by the committee.   |
|                            | <b>Working with families initiative</b>               | Presentation and update on the current status of the complex families project.                             | <b>Phil Newby</b>                          | Report was noted by the committee. Further update will be provided by the project manager at the next committee meeting in October.  |
|                            | <b>One Council Programme update</b>                   | The committee will receive an update on the status of the programme and the individual projects within it. | <b>Peter Stachniewski</b>                  | Update report noted by the committee.  |

|  |  |  |                        |  |
|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| <b>24<sup>th</sup> July 2012</b>               | <b>Move to the Civic Centre</b>            | Committee would like an update on the move.  | <b>Caroline Raihan</b> | Report was noted. Further information regarding the charging strategy requested.   |
|  | <b>Housing Need Transformation Project</b> | A progress update on the project work streams and how the impact of the project is being measured.   | <b>Perry Singh</b>     | Report was noted. Information on the speed at which homeless applicants are being assessed was requested.  |
|  | <b>Performance &amp; Finance review Q4</b> | To provide members with performance information  | <b>Cathy Tyson</b>     | Report was noted. Members have raised concerns about the Waste & Recycling performance figures.  |
| <b>16<sup>th</sup> October 2012</b><br>Page 64 | <b>Complaints Annual Report</b>            | Report will provide members with information on how the council has dealt with complaints during 2011/12 and the impact of the revised 2 stage complaints procedure. | <b>Philip Mears</b>    | Report was noted. Members queried compensation figures and response rates. Feedback to be provided by Philip Mears in response to these queries before the next meeting.   |
|  | <b>Working with families initiative</b>    | The committee will receive a further, more comprehensive update.   | <b>Robert Hardy</b>    | The presentation was well received. Members requested further information relating to the financial breakdown of the initiative and the Family Nurse Partnership in Brent. Robert Hardy will respond before the next meeting |
|  | <b>Performance &amp; Finance review Q1</b> | To provide members with performance information  | <b>Phil Newby</b>      | Report was noted. Members requested for more benchmarking information and clarity on budget setting. Further information was   |

|         |                               |  |  |  |  |
|---------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|         |                               |  |  | requested on the number of successful SEN statements and queried whether adoption figures could be included on the report. Members have requested for a verbal update on all Red Rag status projects from the One Council Programme. |  |
| Page 65 | 5 <sup>th</sup> December 2012 | One Council Programme update             | The committee will receive an update on the status of the programme and the individual projects within it. | Peter Stachniewski   | Report was noted.  |
|         |                               | Future Customer Service Project          | Update on the status of the project and what the main challenges have been.                                | Tony McConvile / Margaret Read   | Report was noted and it was agreed that the parking project could be considered at a future meeting. The Chair also requested that improvements in percentage of telephone performance and in processes be included in future reports. |
|         |                               | Waste & Recycling Transformation Project | Members have requested for a further update on the waste contract.   | Chris Whyte  | Report was noted.  |
|         | 6 <sup>th</sup> February 2013 | Project Athena                           | Report to provide members with an update, highlighting the main developments since January.                | Andrew Donald/Denis Turner   | Report was noted and the chair requested that details of the costs of the new system be provided and for comparisons to be made with the costs of the five other London borough partners.  |

|                      |  |   |   |   |
|----------------------|--|---|---|---|
|                      | <b>Procurement Project</b>                           | Members will receive a verbal update on the project following a request by committee.   | <b>Fiona Ledden</b>                     | Update was noted and the chair requested that the committee be provided with a list of regular suppliers and what steps were being taken to reduce the number of these. |
|                      | <b>Realignment of Corporate and Business Support</b> | This has not been presented to committee and is currently in delivery. Project will be of interest to members in light of concerns raised around staffing at the last meeting.          | <b>Frank Dick/Joanna Swinton- Bland</b> | Report was noted.   |
|                      | <b>Performance &amp; Finance review Q2</b>           | To provide members with performance information<br>Update will also include a verbal progress report on any One Council Projects at a Red status.                                       | <b>Phil Newby</b>                       | This item was deferred to the next meeting.   |
| <b>21 March 2013</b> | <b>Managing the Public Realm</b>                     | Project is currently in delivery and committee will be interested to receive an update on how Brent is now progressing with this following withdrawal from the other councils involved. | <b>Jenny Isaac</b>                      |   |
|                      | <b>Re procurement of Parking Enforcement</b>         | Committee will receive an update on the re-procurement of our parking enforcement and notice processing contracts, changes to permits, pricing and many other issues.                   | <b>Michael Read/David Thrall</b>        |   |
|                      | <b>Performance &amp; Finance review Q3</b>           | To provide members with performance information   | <b>Phil Newby</b>                       |   |

|   |   |   |                             |  |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|--|
|   |   |   |                             |  |
| <p><b>Items to be timetabled for future meetings:</b></p> | <p>SEN statements. A report on how many statements have been approved this year and what are the current approval procedures has been requested.</p> <p>Future Customer Service Project</p> | <p>It was agreed at the December meeting, that it would be more appropriate for this item to go to the Children &amp; Young People O&amp;S committee</p> <p>Members have requested for this to come back to committee in the future. Members have requested information on comparison figures on performance and processes for all services. Members would also like future reports to include figures for average time, duration of calls and waiting times for callers.</p> | <p><b>Margaret Read</b></p> |  |
|   | <p>Libraries Transformation Project</p>   | <p>Members would like an update to see how this is being developed.</p>   |                             |  |

This page is intentionally left blank