

Call-In Sub-Committee **AGENDA**

DATE: Monday 1 October 2012

TIME: 7.45 pm

VENUE: Committee Rooms 1 and 2,
Harrow Civic Centre

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 3)

Chairman: Councillor Jerry Miles

Councillors:

Sue Anderson
Ann Gate

Susan Hall
Paul Osborn

Reserve Members:

1. Nana Asante
2. Ajay Maru
3. Krishna James

1. Barry Macleod-Cullinane
2. Tony Ferrari
3. Kam Chana

Contact: Alison Atherton, Senior Professional Democratic Services
Tel: 020 8424 1266 E-mail: alison.atherton@harrow.gov.uk

AGENDA - PART I

1. ATTENDANCE BY RESERVE MEMBERS

To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.

Reserve Members may attend meetings:-

- (i) to take the place of an ordinary Member for whom they are a reserve;
- (ii) where the ordinary Member will be absent for the whole of the meeting; and
- (iii) the meeting notes at the start of the meeting at the item 'Reserves' that the Reserve Member is or will be attending as a reserve;
- (iv) if a Reserve Member whose intention to attend has been noted arrives after the commencement of the meeting, then that Reserve Member can only act as a Member from the start of the next item of business on the agenda after his/her arrival.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive declarations of disclosable pecuniary or non pecuniary interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:

- (a) all Members of the Sub-Committee;
- (b) all other Members present.

3. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

To consider the appointment of a Vice-Chairman to the Sub Committee for the Municipal Year 2012/13

4. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 8)

That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 February 2012 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

5. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE CALL-IN SUB-COMMITTEE (Pages 9 - 10)

To consider and note the Sub-Committee's Terms of Reference.

6. PROTOCOL FOR THE OPERATION OF THE CALL-IN SUB-COMMITTEE (Pages 11 - 12)

7. CALL-IN OF CABINET DECISION (13 SEPTEMBER 2012) - PUBLIC REALM INTEGRATED SERVICES MODEL: BUSINESS CASE (Pages 13 - 58)

The following documents are attached:-

- a) Notices invoking the Call-in
- b) Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting held on 13 September 2012
- c) Report submitted to Cabinet on 13 September 2012

AGENDA - PART II

8. CALL-IN OF CABINET DECISION (13 SEPTEMBER 2012) - PUBLIC REALM INTEGRATED SERVICES MODEL: BUSINESS CASE (Pages 59 - 208)

Appendix 2 to the officer report submitted to the Cabinet meeting on 13 September 2012.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, this meeting is being called with less than 5 clear working days' notice by virtue of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency stated below:-

Under Committee Procedure Rule 46.6 a meeting of the Call-In Sub-Committee must be held within 7 clear working days of the receipt of a request for call-in. This meeting therefore had to be arranged at very short notice and it was not possible for the agenda to be published 5 clear working days prior to the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

CALL-IN SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES

28 FEBRUARY 2012

Chairman: * Councillor Jerry Miles

Councillors: * Sue Anderson * Ajay Maru (3)
* Tony Ferrari (1) * Paul Osborn

In attendance: Graham Henson Minute 18
(Councillors) Barry Macleod-Cullinane
Bill Phillips
Stephen Wright

* Denotes Member present
(1) and (3) Denote category of Reserve Members

14. Attendance by Reserve Members

RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:-

Ordinary Member

Councillor Susan Hall
Councillor Sachin Shah

Reserve Member

Councillor Tony Ferrari
Councillor Ajay Maru

15. Declarations of Interest

Members of the Sub-Committee referred to the Councillor Code of Conduct and raised concerns about the presence of three Members of Cabinet in attendance at the meeting. Following advice from an officer and clarification as to their role in the meeting, the three Cabinet Members left the room due to their prejudicial interest in the item that was the subject of the Call In notice.

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 5 – Call-In of Cabinet Decision (9 February 2012) – Transformation Programme Mobile and Flexible Working

Councillor Sue Anderson declared a personal interest in relation to the HMRC working from home allowance. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Graham Henson declared a personal interest in that he had a cousin who worked for the Council and a prejudicial interest as a member of the Cabinet that had taken the decision on mobile and flexible working. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon as he was responding to the Call In.

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane, who was not a member of the Sub-Committee, declared a personal interest in that his sister was a teacher in a Harrow School. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Paul Osborn declared a personal interest in that he had received hospitality from Capita that was in excess of £25.00 in value. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

16. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2011 be taken as read and signed as a correct record subject to noting that a Member of the Sub-Committee had given an undertaking that the Corporate Director of Place Shaping would carry out consultation.

17. Protocol for the Operation of the Call-In Sub-Committee

The Chair drew attention to the document 'Protocol for the Operation of the Call-In Sub-Committee' which was included with the agenda papers and read paragraphs 5 and 8 to the meeting. The Chairman outlined the procedure to be followed at the meeting and explained that, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 46.5, a notice seeking to invoke the call-in procedure must state at least one of the following grounds in support of the request for a call-in of the decision:-

- (a) inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision;
- (b) the absence of adequate evidence on which to base a decision;
- (c) the decision is contrary to the policy framework, or contrary to, or not wholly in accordance with the budget framework;
- (d) the action is not proportionate to the desired outcome;
- (e) a potential human rights challenge;
- (f) insufficient consideration of legal and financial advice.

RESOLVED ITEMS

18. Call-In of Cabinet Decision (9 February 2012) - Transformation Programme Mobile and Flexible Working

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Macleod-Cullinane, lead signatory to the call-in notice, to the meeting. He also welcomed the Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services, who was in attendance, with his Cabinet Assistant, to respond to the call-in as part of a requirement of that process, the Corporate Director of Place Shaping and the Director of Customer Services and Business Transformation. In accordance with Committee Rule 4.1.1, the Sub-Committee agreed that Councillor Stephen Wright could speak on behalf of the signatories at the meeting.

The Chairman, prior to the commencement of the consideration of the call-ins in relation to the decision made by Cabinet on 9 February 2012 on the Transformation Programme Mobile and Flexible Working, detailed the papers available to the Sub-Committee. The call-in notice was submitted by seven Members of Council and cited 2 of the grounds set out in the Protocol (a and b).

Councillor Macleod-Cullinane confirmed that the Members call-in related to the decision made by Cabinet on the Transformation Programme Mobile and Flexible Working taken on 9 February 2012. He also confirmed that the basis of their reasons for call-in related to grounds (a) and (b) of the Protocol, namely that there was inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision and there was an absence of adequate evidence on which to base a decision.

Councillors Macleod-Cullinane and Wright outlined their reasons relating to each of the grounds raised in the call-in notice. During the course of their presentation, they raised the following issues:

- Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were a key stakeholder and as such had requested a briefing on Mobile and Flexible Working. The proposals were a fundamental change, involved a significant amount of resource and affected a number of staff.
- Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had not been given sufficient opportunity to challenge the proposals and had been led to believe that there would be a briefing prior to Cabinet.
- Insufficient attention had been given to Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as stakeholders.
- There had been a briefing to the Administration on 14 January 2012 but the same opportunity had not been given to Members of the Opposition and therefore paragraph 3.1 of the Member/Officer Protocol had been breached. In addition, the leadership of the major Opposition had not been kept informed on the proposals.

- Part II information had not been provided to members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee nor to Cabinet Members and therefore it was stated that information had not been available to Members in making their decision.
- The table detailing the savings did not explain how these would be made year on year. There was no justification for the decision.
- Whilst the outcome of the decision might be correct how it was arrived at was not supported by documented evidence.
- The Sub-Committee needed to determine whether the correct decision-making process had been followed.
- The briefing to members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been held on 22 February 2012, after Cabinet had taken its decision. A briefing had been requested before Christmas but the date set, 24 January 2011, was subsequently postponed and re-arranged until after Cabinet on 9 February 2012. At the re-arranged briefing on 22 February, Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were provided with papers additional to those submitted to Cabinet and were therefore not afforded the opportunity to assess them prior to the decision being taken.

In conclusion, it was stated that there was inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision and an absence of adequate evidence on which to base a decision. The representatives of the signatories stated that whilst there may have been evidence, it had not been presented to Cabinet. The process had, in the signatories view, not been transparent.

The Chairman then invited the Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services to address the Sub-Committee. He made a statement to the meeting which included the following points:

- At no time had he been advised that the Members had requested a briefing and he was not aware of any repeated requests. There had been a meeting with the lead officer, the Vice-Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Chair of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 17 October 2011 to discuss the project. Further to this, there had been a briefing on 15 December 2011 with a scrutiny lead Members briefing held prior to that on 7 September 2011.
- There was no statutory or Constitutional requirement to consult with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on this project. The published Forward Plan had identified the relevant stakeholders as staff and Trade Unions.
- The October Forward Plan had advised that Mobile and Flexible Working would be considered by Cabinet in November 2011. The November Plan amended this to indicate that the report would be considered in February 2012. Similarly, a response provided to a

Cabinet question in January included reference to the report being considered by Cabinet in February. This would mean that the proposals would be considered alongside the budget which was his preference.

- It was unfortunate that the briefing scheduled to be held on 24 January 2012 had to be re-arranged but officers from the Scrutiny team had organised the briefing on 22 February 2012. Place Shaping had played no part in organising the re-arranged briefing.
- Members would be welcome to work with him and his Cabinet assistant on the project.
- In terms of the evidence on which the decision was based, Cabinet made strategic level policy decisions. As Portfolio Holder, he had been fully involved in the review of the business case and he was satisfied that Cabinet had received all the information they needed to make the decision.

In conclusion, the Portfolio Holder stated that project was crucial to the development of the Council's business. Subject to the outcome of this meeting, the project could be initiated and there would be a full and detailed review and input from Councillor colleagues would be welcomed.

The Chairman invited the representatives of the signatories to ask questions of the Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services. The questions were responded to by the Portfolio Holder and the Corporate Director as follows:

- The evidence for increased productivity referred to on page 22 of the report was set out in Appendix A and the summary on page 21 listed the organisations that had done similar work. The lead signatory challenged this response and requested details of the case studies and comparisons with other local authorities.
- Cabinet made strategic long term decisions and evidence had been gathered through the compilation of the business case. The revenue and capital figures had been demonstrated at a high level and the project manager had worked closely with the Portfolio Holder.
- The project would enable many staff who worked in field based situations to have access to business systems and to deal with enquiries in real time.
- In terms of the timeline, the strategic policy had to be considered alongside the setting of the Council budget.
- In response to the concern expressed that the project had been rushed through and that there had been no opportunity to scrutinise it, Members were advised that, since October, it had been made clear that this project was linked to the budget process. There had been

discussion by officers at one stage that report might go to March Cabinet but Members had been clear that it need to be tied in to the budget discussions. Furthermore, as this project had already been included in the budget, it had not really been necessary to submit it to Cabinet as a separate item.

- Following reference to the financial implications and performance issues paragraphs and the challenge that decision makers were not presented with options, the Corporate Director advised that the other organisations contacted about this project had indicated that Harrow's solution, with hindsight, would have been their preferred option. The key message from other organisations had been that the implementation of the technology had been the easiest part of the project and that business and cultural change were the more challenging aspects. There had been extensive investigations with other organisations who had run similar projects and officers were of the view that the appropriate recommendations had been made to Cabinet.
- The scope had not been rushed through and the focus had been on having complete confidence in the recommendations put forward.
- Referring the lead signatory's comments in relation to adherence to paragraph 5.7 of the Member/Officer Protocol and the issue of whether Opposition Members should have been informed as to whether a report had been prepared, the Corporate Director stated that whilst he was disappointed that it appeared that Members expectations had not been met, the publication of the entry in the October and subsequent Forward Plans did, in his view, meet the requirements of the Protocol.

The Chairman then invited Members of the Sub-Committee to ask questions of the signatories and the Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services and to make comments. The questions and comments were responded to as follows:

- The level of briefing expected by Members had not materialised and whilst the project manager had met with some Members and 1.5 pages of information provided, no further briefings had been provided after 17 October.
- A Member of the Sub-Committee stated that following the briefing in the autumn, Members had advised the Scrutiny team that Mobile and Flexible Working was an area they wished to consider. The only date that been available was 24 January and this had subsequently been cancelled. If it had been drawn to both her and the scrutiny team's attention that the new date, 22 February, would affect Members ability to consider the proposals she would have raised this as an issue. The Corporate Director stated that it was unfortunate that there had been slippage but it seemed that there had been a mismatch between the officers organising the meeting and his department and he undertook to take this on board.

- The Corporate Director stated that he could not recollect advising the Vice Chair of the Sub-Committee that the report would be submitted to March Cabinet but apologised if he had. There had been discussion at officer level only about the possible change of submission date. The Portfolio Holder added that he would have advised Cabinet at its January meeting when considering the Forward Plan if there had been any intention to change the submission date.
- It was acknowledged by a Member that a briefing on the technology had been received but not on the resources issues. When he had been a Portfolio Holder he had ensured that Members from all Groups had received briefings and this had also been written into the Constitution.

(The Sub-Committee adjourned from 7.27 pm - 7.40 pm to enable the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that was scheduled for the same evening to commence and then be adjourned until the conclusion of the Sub-Committee meeting).

- A Member stated that he had read the full business case, Outline Business Case and Cabinet report and challenged what specific examples there were of the savings made by other Councils. The Corporate Director advised that the documentation was set out in the business case and that the figures had been discussed in detail with the Portfolio Holder. The cost model, which was an A3 appendix to the business case, provided a summary of the figures. He added that the Cabinet report set out, at a high level, the technology solution and figures. Cabinet had approved the strategic policy proposition and Council had approved the resourcing and it was now intended to move forward to the initiation stage, the first action of which would be to review and update the business case.
- A Member expressed concern that there appeared to be no document detailing the source of the projected benefit and stated that he would have expected to see details of both the best and worse case scenarios. He added that there was no evidence upon which to base a £10m decision. The Corporate Director responded that in relation to the source of the benefits, whilst he could not provide that level of detail, the project manager had spent a significant amount of time fine tuning and rationalising the recommendations to Members. In terms of the decision itself, it would result in less than a 2% shift in productivity over 9 years. The Portfolio Holder added that the budget had been signed off by the Section 151 Officer.
- In response to the comment that it appeared that Opposition Members were not regarded as stakeholders, the Portfolio Holder advised that no one had raised the issue of consultation with him nor had it been raised at Council. A Member stated that the issue of the briefing had been raised with both the Leader and Chief Executive, following the Special

meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 31 January 2012.

The Chairman thanked the signatories, Portfolio Holder and Corporate Director for their attendance and participation.

(The Sub-Committee then adjourned from 8.02 pm – 8.35 pm to receive legal advice).

Upon reconvening, having noted a Member of the Sub-Committee's concerns in relation to lack of evidence to support the savings expected from the project, the Chairman announced the decision of the Sub-Committee and it was

RESOLVED: That

- (1) (unanimously) the call-in on ground (a) – inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision - be upheld and referred back to Cabinet for re-consideration as Members felt let down by officers because when the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members requested a briefing on an item before Cabinet, they would expect to have received it before the Cabinet meeting took place.
- (2) the call-in on ground (b) - the absence of adequate evidence on which to base a decision – not be upheld due to insufficient grounds.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.01 pm, closed at 8.40 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES
Chairman

CALL- IN SUB-COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Call-In Sub-Committee has the following powers and duties:

- (a) to examine decisions of the Executive which are taken but not implemented, and which are 'called in' in accordance with the Committee Procedure Rules;
- (b) to refer matters called in to the decision taker with reasons and recommendations for changes;
- (c) to refer Executive decisions to full Council if they consider they are contrary to the policy framework or contrary to or not wholly in accordance with the budget

This page is intentionally left blank

PROTOCOL FOR THE OPERATION OF THE CALL-IN SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Call-in is the process whereby a decision of the Executive, Portfolio Holder or Officer (where the latter is taking a Key Decision) taken but not implemented, may be examined by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee prior to implementation. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee has established the Call-in Sub-Committee to carry out this role. Committee Procedure Rule 46 sets out the rules governing the call-in process.

The Process for Call-in

2. Six of the Members of the Council can call in a decision of the Executive which has been taken but not implemented. In relation to Executive decisions on education matters only, the number of Members required to call in a decision which has been made but not implemented shall be six Councillors or, in the alternative, six persons comprising representatives of the voting co-opted members and at least one political group on Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Only decisions relating to Executive functions, whether delegated or not, may be called in.

150 members of the public (defined as anyone registered on the electoral roll of the Borough) can call in a decision of the Executive, which has been taken but not implemented.

3. Decisions of the Executive will not be implemented for 5 clear working days following the publication of the decision and a decision can only be called in within this period (this does not apply to urgent decisions - Committee Procedure Rule 47 refers). The notice of the decision will state the date on which the decisions may be implemented if not called in.

4. Call-in must be by notification to the Monitoring Officer in writing or by fax:

i) signed by all six Members and voting co-optees requesting the call-in. A request for call-in by e-mail will require a separate e-mail from each of the six Members concerned.

ii) signed by all 150 members of the public registered on the electoral roll, and stating their names and addresses.

5. In accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 46.5, a notice seeking to invoke the call-in procedure must state at least one of the following grounds in support of the request for a call-in of the decision:-

- (a) inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision;
- (b) the absence of adequate evidence on which to base a decision;
- (c) the decision is contrary to the policy framework, or contrary to, or not wholly in accordance with the budget framework;
- (d) the action is not proportionate to the desired outcome;
- (e) a potential human rights challenge;
- (f) insufficient consideration of legal and financial advice.

Referral to the Call-in Sub-Committee

6. Once a notice invoking the call-in procedure has been received, the decision may not be implemented until the Chair and nominated member have considered the guidance outlined in Appendix 1 to the Committee Procedure Rules and, if required, the Call-in Sub-Committee has considered the decision. The Monitoring Officer shall in consultation with the Chair arrange a meeting of the Call-in Sub-Committee to be held within seven clear working days of the receipt of the request for call-in.

7. The Call-in Sub-Committee will consider the decision and the reasons for call-in. The Sub-Committee may invite the Executive decision-taker and a representative of those calling in the decision to provide information at the meeting.

8. The Sub-Committee may come to one of the following conclusions:-
- (i) that the challenge to the decision should be taken no further and the decision be implemented;
 - (ii) that the decision is contrary to the policy framework or contrary to or not wholly in accordance with the budget framework, and should not therefore be referred to the Council. In such a case the Call-in sub-committee must set out the nature of its concerns for Council; or
 - (iii) that the matter should be referred back to the decision taker (i.e the Portfolio Holder or Executive, whichever took the decision) for reconsideration. In such a case the Call-in sub-committee must set out the nature of its concerns for the decision taker/Executive.

Agenda Item 7a

"I hereby give notice that I wish to call-in the decision 'Public Realm Integrated Services Model: Business Case', taken by Cabinet on 13th September 2012.

The reasons for this call-in are as follows:

Inadequate Consideration of Legal Advice

Before the PRISM decision was taken, it emerged that bringing this decision to September's Cabinet was not compliant with DCLG Regulations for Key Decisions or confidential meetings.

The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 came into force on 10th September. The PRISM item contained documentation that required a Part II/private portion of the meeting. The new regulations state at s.5 that 28 days notice must be given of the intention to hold a private meeting. In this instance, this did not occur; PRISM was not even listed on the Forward Plan.

In addition, s.9 states that when an item is a key decision, 28 days notice is also required - which again did not occur in this instance. It would appear from an answer given by Cllr. Graham Henson at the Cabinet meeting that the Council's legal department neither provided advice on this issue, nor felt it necessary to provide advice due to the date of the meeting. **Therefore, in taking this decision without properly encompassing the legal implications of these Regulations, Cabinet has not adequately considered legal advice that should have been forthcoming.**

Inadequate Consultation With Stakeholders

The PRISM decision has been brought to Cabinet in a rush. Not only has this resulted in DCLG Regulations not being followed, it has also limited the time allowed for proper examination of the business case. PRISM was included in the Council's 2012/13 budget; it was a significant part of the savings plans for the Environment Department. However, the sudden appearance of PRISM at the September Cabinet was the first opportunity for the majority of councillors - including Overview and Scrutiny Members - employees, union representatives and others, to view the final business case. A copy of the business case was also not provided in the Members' Library, **despite the Cabinet report clearly stating 'A hard copy has been placed in the Members' Library'.**

When the Mobile and Flexible Working decision was successfully called-in in February 2012, it was because Overview and Scrutiny had not been afforded a briefing on the decision. That meeting resolved that: **That "(1) (unanimously) the call-in on ground (a) – inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision - be upheld and referred back to Cabinet for re-consideration as Members felt let down by officers because when the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members**

requested a briefing on an item before Cabinet, they would expect to have received it before the Cabinet meeting took place."

The undue haste of the PRISM decision being rushed through Cabinet prevents such a briefing from taking place yet again, and suggests the intention may have been to circumvent such scrutiny.

It is worth noting that the business case had undergone its final draft by the 9th August, and went before CSB on 15th August. The new model is also not set to go live until April 2013. For these reasons, there is no justification for why the decision had to go Cabinet so suddenly in September, no justification for why it was kept off the Forward Plan, and no attempt has even been made to justify why it was kept off the Forward Plan - either at Cabinet or on the notice sent out a few days before. It can hardly have been a surprise that a decision of this significance needed to come to Cabinet, and should therefore have been on the Forward Plan.

Even before the new Regulations were published, DCLG guidance ('New Council Constitutions') on the equivalent regulations published in 2000 stated that Forward Plans should take into account the timetable of meetings, and that Overview and Scrutiny committees should have an opportunity to review them - ideally two weeks before the commencement of the weeks covered (*3.76, 7.12, 7.14). None of these factors were considered in this instance.

Had the 28 day requirement of the regulations been adhered to, sufficient time would have been afforded to allow the proposals to be examined. However, given it was not on the Forward Plan, and no notice was given that Cabinet was due to make the decision until the Agenda was published, the actual publication of the documents was the first time Members and others were able to see the business case in detail. **Therefore, there has not been consultation and discussion with sufficient bodies within and external to the Council - over a decision which will impact a highly visible and significant service.**

* 'New Council Constitutions'

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/localgovernment/pdf/155181.pdf>

Notices submitted by the following Councillors on 19 and 20 September 2012:

Kam Chana

Stephen Greek

Barry Macleod-Cullinane

Chris Mote

Janet Mote

John Nickolay

Joyce Nickolay

Simon Williams

Stephen Wright



Harrow L.G. Branch
The UNISON Office
Central Depot, Forward Drive
Harrow, Middlesex
UK
HA3 8NT
Tel: 020 8424 1795
Fax: 020 8424 1835

Email: info@harrow-unison.org.uk
Web: www.harrow-unison.org.uk

Branch Secretary: Gary Martin

Friday 21st September 2012

To: The Director of Legal and Governance Services

Harrow Council Call-in Notice

Matter Called-in: Public Realm Integrated Services Model (PRISM): Business Case

Decision: That;

- (1) The implementation of the Transformation Project for the Public Realm Integrated Services Model, as set out in the Full Business Case, be agreed;
- (2) The Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise, in liaison with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety, take the necessary actions to implement the Project.

Reason for Decision: To achieve the savings targets agreed previously in the MTFs and transform the services covered by the Project.

Decision Notice date: 13 September 2012 (published on 14 September 2012)

Made by: Cabinet

In accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 22 of Harrow Council's Constitution, we, the signatories to this call-in notice, being members of the public registered of the electoral roll of the London Borough of Harrow, hereby give notice that we wish to call-in the Decision as detailed above.

Grounds for Call-In

In accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 22.5, the below contains the grounds for call-in and refers to evidence in support of this call-in which UNISON, on behalf of the undersigned, can provide upon request:

(a) Inadequate consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision

i) On behalf of the Council the officer/s responsible for PRISM did not take adequate consideration of the public sector equality duty in failing to allow adequate consultation of the project's Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA). Despite UNISON requests for a relevant EqIA in various consultation meetings prior to Cabinet decision on the 13th September 2012, management did not produce the requested documentation making it impossible for UNISON representatives to provide any meaningful comment or dialogue on any equality impact related to the decision to implement PRISM.

ii) The HR1 redundancy notice form (a legal notice employers are required to supply Government and employee/union representatives when a certain number of redundancies are planned) supplied on the 7th September 2012 stated that the consultation process had started with representatives but failed to stipulate on the required legal form the date consultation started.

One is a lonely number, join UNISON and you're one in a million.....

Harrow UNISON:



Furthermore, the HR1 form does not comply or reflect the numbers of posts released as stated and agreed by Cabinet within the Full Business Case which makes reference to fifty three possible redundancies.

iii) In addition to point (ii) the HR1 form stipulates that there is a need to make redundancies for the purpose of 'changes in work methods or organisation'. This reason has not been adequately consulted upon as evident from the content of the Full Business Case which fails to provide a proposed staffing structure.

(b) The absence of adequate evidence on which to base a decision

The EqIA accompanying the Cabinet report (Agenda Item 17, pages 455-492, 13 September 2012) does not relate or reflect the actual impact of the PRISM project which has been communicated by other formal means (HR1 notification) to UNISON and involves a significant reduction in the workforce. The EqIA is dated the 25th July 2012 and makes numerous references to the implications of a transfer (TUPE) situation as a result of the adoption of the 'social enterprise model'. This document fails to mention the reduction of staff envisaged and states that the responsible officer (the author of the document) does not envisage any adverse equality impact. We firmly believe that Cabinet were supplied incorrectly with inadequate information and evidence which they could not have taken into account before deciding to agree implementation of PRISM.

(c) The decision is contrary to the policy framework, or contrary to, or not wholly in accordance with the budget framework

UNISON received the HR1 form on the 7th September 2012 notifying that a possible fifty five redundancies are planned as a result of the implementation of PRISM. The notice was received nearly a week before Cabinet met on the 13th September 2012 which breaches the corporate governance and constitutional requirements of the Council. We firmly believe the responsible officer/s acted ultra vires in pre-empting a Cabinet decision four working days before the democratic decision was made.

(d) The action is not proportionate to the desired outcome

The outcome to achieve improvements in service standards or the same service standards prior to the decision to implement PRISM cannot be justified on recent census figures (2011). The reduction of twelve manual staff and four refuse vehicles would fail to meet the increase in providing services to a growing population of Harrow which has increased by 15.6% since the last census reported in 2001. The number of households in the borough have also seen a dramatic increase of 7% (over 84,000) and with the Governments recently launched House Building Strategy coming into play which has overseen the approval of 985 new homes to be built on the Kodak site, an eroded workforce will not be able to meet the needs of Harrow's new and burgeoning population.

(e) A potential human rights challenge

Ground b (as stated above) may constitute a challenge under UK equalities legislation or a judicial review to reconsider as a legal complaint with the High Court a declaration that the decision was an unlawful breach of the public sector equality duty.

(f) Insufficient consideration of legal and financial advice;

In facilitating and progressing the implementation of PRISM in private as a Part II meeting, Harrow Council's Cabinet, the Portfolio Holder and responsible officer/s did not comply with the statutory requirements as laid within The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012. The Council did not inform of its intention 28 days before it was convened that the meeting was to be held in private or publish that notice on the Council's website or allow the public and other Members to make representations to the contrary. The Council did not act in accordance with the relevant regulations of this statutory provision which ensure English Council's are open and transparent in their executive decision making. No consideration of this law was taken into account before implementing PRISM making it unlawful.

Harrow UNISON Local Government Branch

One is a lonely number, join UNISON and you're one in a million.....
Harrow UNISON: An award winning Branch

Received 12 53
21/9/12

CALL-IN NOTICE

To be completed by Members of the Public, as per the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 22.2(b).

To: The Director of Legal and Governance Services

1. Notice of Call-In of Executive Decision

In accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 22, we, the 150 signatories to this call-in notice (see numbered continuation sheets overleaf), being members of the public registered on the electoral roll of the London Borough of Harrow, hereby give notice that we wish to call-in the Executive decision detailed in section 2 below.

2. Details of Executive Decision

The details of the Executive decision are as follows:-

Decision: Public Realm Integrated Services Model (PRISM) Business Case

Made by: Cabinet
(Cabinet/relevant Portfolio Holder)

Published on: 14th September 2012
(Date)

3. Grounds for Call-In

(Please specify below the grounds for the call-in, in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 22.5. Please note that, in the event that this call-in is referred to the Call-in Sub-Committee, the considerations of the Sub-Committee will focus on the grounds stated, and the Sub-Committee will seek evidence to support them. Please therefore also set out below details of the evidence to support the grounds for call-in, continuing on a separate sheet if necessary).

Grounds Attached within supporting document dated 21st September 2012.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Once completed, please forward this form to Damian Markland, Legal & Governance Services, Harrow Council, Room 143, Civic Centre, HA1 2UH or send it by fax to 020 8424 1557 WITHIN 5 CLEAR WORKING DAYS OF THE DATE OF PUBLICATION OF THE DECISION.

CABINET MINUTES

13 SEPTEMBER 2012

[DRAFT MINUTE]

Chairman: † Councillor Bill Stephenson

Councillors:

* Bob Currie	* Graham Henson
* Margaret Davine	† Phillip O'Dell
* Keith Ferry	* David Perry
* Brian Gate	* Sachin Shah

In attendance: Susan Hall Minute 482
(Councillors) Paul Osborn Minute 482

* Denotes Member present
† Denotes apologies received

RESOLVED ITEMS

495. Public Realm Integrated Services Model: Business Case

The Divisional Director of Environmental Services introduced the report, which set out a summary of the full business case developed for the Public Realm Integrated Services Management (PRISM) transformation project intended to change the arrangements for service delivery in the Environment Division of the Directorate of Environment and Enterprise. The proposals would also achieve savings for 2013/14 previously identified in the Medium Term Financial Strategy. Cabinet also considered a confidential appendix setting out the full business case for the proposals.

The Divisional Director added that the proposals, if approved, would entail in an increased use of new technology which would also help ensure a greater presence and visibility on the borough's streets, reduce the number of staff

employed although front line service would be protected, and a different way of working.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise, corrected the reference to the Trading Standards service in paragraph 7 on page 459 of the agenda. The service was described as outsourced to Brent, but it was in fact a formal partnership between Harrow and Brent Councils, hosted by Brent. The Portfolio Holder asked how the project impacted on Service Standards.

The Divisional Director acknowledged the correction made and, in relation to the question, replied that the project protected current Service Standards and would introduce greater efficiency and performance management, thereby improving value for money.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the implementation of the Transformation Project for the Public Realm Integrated Services Model, as set out in the Full Business Case, be agreed;
- (2) the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise, in liaison with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety, take the necessary actions to implement the Project.

Reason for Decision: To achieve the savings targets agreed previously in the MTFS and transform the services covered by the Project.

Alternative Options considered and rejected: As set out in appendix 2 of the officer report.

Conflict of Interest relating to the matter declared by Cabinet Member / Dispensation granted: None.

498. Public Realm Integrated Services Model: Business Case

RESOLVED: That appendix 2 be noted.

Reason for Decision: To allow the appendix to be considered in conjunction with the main report at agenda item 17.

Alternative Options considered and rejected: As set out under item 17.

Conflict of Interest relating to the matter declared by Cabinet Member / Dispensation granted: As set out under item 17.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.50 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR THAYA IDAIKKADAR
Chairman

REPORT FOR: CABINET

Date of Meeting:	13 September 2012
Subject:	Public Realm Integrated Services Model: Business Case
Key Decision:	Yes
Responsible Officer:	John Edwards, Divisional Director for Environment
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Phillip O'Dell, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety
Exempt:	No, apart from Appendix 2, which is exempt by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 in that it contains information relating to the financial and business affairs of the authority holding that information
Decision subject to Call-in:	Yes
Enclosures:	Equality Implications – Appendix 1 Full Business Case – Appendix 2 (Part II – Exempt) – <i>Due to its size, appendix 2, it has been circulated to Cabinet Members, the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group and key officer(s) only. A hard copy has been placed in the Members' Library and Group Offices</i>

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out a summary of the full business case developed for the Public Realm Integrated Services Management transformation project which will change the arrangements for service delivery in the Environment Division of the Directorate of Environment and Enterprise. This will achieve savings for 2013-14 previously identified in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

Recommendations:

Cabinet is requested to agree

1. The implementation of the transformation project for the Public Realm Integrated Services Model as set out in the Full Business Case
2. To delegate to the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise in liaison with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community to take the necessary actions to implement the project.

Reason: (For recommendation)

To achieve the savings targets agreed previously in the Medium Term Financial Strategy and transform the services covered by the project.

Section 2 – Report

Introduction

Forecasts show that Harrow Council faces a continuing need to make significant savings to achieve a balanced budget. The Medium Term Financial Strategy agreed at the Council meeting on 16 February 2012 included a saving of £1.5m from the Environment budgets of the 2013-2014 financial year through a transformation project looking at providing more integrated services and investigating alternative models of delivery, with further savings of £350,000 the year after. The project was named PRISM – Public Realm Integrated Services Model.

During the last three years, the Environment division and the Business Transformation Partnership (BTP) have successfully delivered cutting edge

and award winning business transformation to achieve significant improvements and savings.

In January 2012, the Environment division commissioned a Business Transformation Programme project team to develop two Business Cases that would:

1. Review how a Public Realm Integrated Service Model (PRISM), encompassing a major business redesign underpinned by technology, could deliver significant cost savings whilst delivering improved services in the areas of Community Safety Services, Highways and Public Realm Services
2. Evaluate how Alternative Delivery Methods (ADM) could deliver further transformational change and savings. The alternative models consisted of Outsourcing and a Social Enterprise Model initially for Public Realm Services, with other services to follow post the PRISM project

Developing the Full Business Case

The BTP Project Team conducted a comprehensive review of the Environment Division in scope of the project, looking at current ways of working and developing proposals for future improvements and savings. The Property Services part of the Environment Division is excluded because there is already a transformation project in progress for this area.

There have been a number of workshops with the staff of Environment, as well as advice and assistance from external sources.

The key activities have been:

- Verification of current organisational structures
- Mapping of the functions performed by the Environment Division (both statutory and discretionary)
- High level examination of business processes
- A soft market testing exercise principally focussed on the services within Public Realm through an external organisation
- Consideration of alternative organisational structures including social enterprises
- A legal assessment of alternative structures through an external organisation
- A social enterprise readiness assessment through an external organisation
- Engagement with staff and trade unions.
- Produce recommendations for a new operating model, the IT improvements to support the model, and the resources needed to implement the transformation.

Service Areas in Scope

The development of the full business case provided an overview of the current service delivery and the current issues that could be overcome through the project:

1. **Highways** - Engineering Services Traffic and Highways Network Management
2. **Community Safety Services** - Public Realm Enforcement, Commercial and Environmental Services, Private Sector Housing, and Licensing and Support Services
3. **Public Realm Services** - Waste Management, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance

Highways Overview

Harrow's highway infrastructure is its largest asset, currently valued at £485m. It is the essential network that facilitates the functioning of the transport system and ultimately, the community. Its condition affects every resident, business and person living in or passing through Harrow.

In partnership with Enterprise Mouchel (until 31 March 2012, May Gurney from 1 April 2012) the department provides a professional quality engineering service to maintain and improve 460 km of roads, 935 km of footways, 15,500 street-lights and 3,500 items of illuminated street furniture, 30,000 street furniture items such as road signs, bins and bollards, 19,600 roadside drainage gullies, 82km of watercourse, 65 flood defence structures, 150 highway structures including bridges, footbridges and subways, and, winter gritting of over 140km of main roads.

Highways - Engineering Services (ES)

The team inspects and arranges repairs for all Harrow roads and footways, and deal with all related highway items such as vehicle crossovers street lights and highway drainage. The team also delivers a substantial element of the Transport for London (TfL) programme to reduce congestion, improve road safety and undertake highway works on principal roads.

Additionally, ES deliver specialist one-off projects, e.g. Playbuilder (government-funded provision of parks play equipment), section 106 works and bridge protection for London Underground.

As lead local flood authority and land drainage authority, the department undertakes watercourse maintenance on behalf of the Environment Agency.

They also deliver engineering solutions to a number of other council services, manage and deliver the winter maintenance service, provide a 24/7 professional engineering emergency service to ensure public safety and undertake the management of estate and public roads for new developments.

Additionally there are a significant number of statutory duties that must be undertaken to ensure the continued safety of all users and that prescribed national standards are maintained.

Highways - Traffic and Highway Network Management (THNM)

The team is responsible for developing the Borough's transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP) and all related transport policies and programmes of work, and works closely with the planning authority to ensure policies are joined up with the Local Development Framework. In addition they provide the highway authority input on developments.

The team implements a wide range of traffic and parking management measures required to reduce congestion, improve road safety and improve accessibility for users of the public highway. This includes delivering a programme of transport improvements agreed with the Mayor of London and Transport for London that have been developed following local consultation and engagement and are included in the LIP.

They also provide road safety education to schools across the Borough, provide cycle training and support school walking buses, ensuring that school children develop the confidence necessary to travel independently throughout their lives to reduce the impact of travel to school and influence future travel mode choices.

They are responsible for co-ordinating and regulating over 8,000 works and activities per year affecting the Borough's highway network whilst minimising the impact of these works on all traffic, including pedestrians. The team also discharge the Council's network management duty under the Traffic Management Act.

The THNM service's main aim is to achieve the objectives set out in the Council's revised transport LIP which covers the period up to 2031 and to deliver a 3 year programme of investment up to 2013/14.

Community Safety Services

Community Safety Services deliver a combination of licensing, advisory and enforcement services delivered to residents, businesses and visitors to Harrow. While the majority of services are provided by in house teams, there are two notable exceptions: Trading Standards are outsourced to Brent Council; and Mortuaries service is delivered on a 'bought in' basis from Northwick Park Hospital. Community Safety Services also have an Anti Social Behaviour in close partnership with the Metropolitan Police.

Details of the three key teams of Community Safety Services can be seen below:

- Public Realm Enforcement - With a strong focus on enforcement, the team deals with CCTV, Parking enforcement, Envirocrime and Highways enforcement. Associated areas also dealt with include Cash in Transit and School Crossing Patrols.

- Commercial and Environmental Services - These services focus on public safety, delivering Animal, Food Safety, and Health and Safety at work services.
- Licensing and Housing Services – This team monitor Harrow’s commercial premises to ensure all premises are licensed and operate to legislative standards.

Public Realm Services Overview

Public Realm Services are universal services that are provided to all sections of the community and have a major impact on the overall satisfaction levels for the Council. Departmental core services are street cleansing, waste and recycling collections, parks management and bereavement services, but also cover key areas such as playground maintenance, allotments, arboriculture council-wide fleet management, and the Neighbourhood Champion and Weeks of Action schemes.

Current Issues to be Resolved

Use of unsupported technology eg by Highways Inspectors

The running of unsupported technology presents limitations to Environment Services in moving to a fully mobile platform with integration to the third party contractor system. The time spent traveling back to the office to manually process the data reduces time that should be spent on conducting inspections.

Use of hard copy maps for inspection purposes/Inspector productivity

The use of GPS technology would support the mapping and monitoring of inspected areas and would enable Access Harrow to provide resolution of customer queries at first point of contact

Reporting of defects – duplication and repetition

The lack of appropriate technology is creating a requirement for unnecessary administrative support in the back office

Lack of ‘end to end’ resolution of routine tasks

Process redesign, multi-skilling staff and near real time reporting of these issues via mobile technology would remove this administrative effort, improve resolution time and increase time spent on scheduled work

Lack of ‘end to end’ visibility of service requests

The proposed technology solution will deliver end to end visibility of service request management, providing updates to customers via Access Harrow, the website and the Citizen Portal.

Use of Agency staff on a long term basis in some teams

There is loss of cost effectiveness of this approach as a long-term solution to staffing issues.

Lack of quantitative data

The establishment of standard metrics and targets for the full range of inspections would drive the resource required for this area of work.

Lack of staff visibility – Lone Working and completion of work schedules

The proposed technology solution and process reengineering will remove existing reactive operations and allow supervisors to monitor and review, in real-time, the location and performance of staff in order to ensure effective staff deployment and service quality.

Ineffective sharing of service request information

The proposed technology solution will enable service requests to be allocated to officers in near real time within the closest location of an incident for immediate resolution. Officers will receive real time information regarding service requests and may enable secure access to relevant case history/ additional information.

Limited use of technology for purposes of remote working

Access to back office systems via appropriate hand held devices will enable real time completion of worksheets, reduce the need for hand written notes and reduce time spent in the office thus enabling more time to be spent on-site.

Identification of location of issue

Provision of GIS mapping at the point of the incident report would allow immediate location identification and direct delivery of the service request to the officer.

Service overlap

The TOM organisational restructure and business process review will remove inter-service barriers. Grouping of low level inspections, coupled with route planning and remote access to relevant systems will increase productivity whilst reducing travel-associated costs.

Lack of 'end to end' visibility of service requests

The proposed technology solution will deliver end to end visibility of service request management, providing updates to customers via Access Harrow, the website and the Citizen Portal.

Considerations of the Alternative Delivery Model

Following the work done on developing the full business cases for the projects it was decided to merge the two business cases into one project, which subject to Cabinet agreement would be implemented to develop the service delivery and achieve the savings identified in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

The key findings for the Alternative Delivery Model business case are:

- **Outsource:** The soft market test undertaken to evaluate the outsourcing PRS to an external provider has identified this will not yield significant savings beyond those achievable through other options. The evaluation also commended the service for being well run with the highest kerbside recycling rates in London, excellent revenue generation for dry recyclables, and good street cleaning standards. Outsourcing is therefore an option that should not be further explored as the majority of savings identified can be achieved through further transformation within the current delivery model
- **Social Enterprise:** Due to the 'Type A' services delivered by PRS, it has been confirmed that a Social Enterprise is not immediately possible from a legal standpoint. If the Council were to pursue a 'soft externalisation', the

legal specialists have recommended an intermediate step – the set up of a Controlled Company wholly owned by the Council (in effect, an arms length management organisation). This Controlled Company would then need to trade for a 3-year period to build up a trading history. Only after this stage could it ‘spin out’ as a Social Enterprise and competitively tender for a contract

- As part of the business case, a Social Enterprise Readiness Assessment was undertaken to identify the gaps that would stop the service from successfully ‘spinning out’ from the Council. The gaps uncovered were significant and several recommendations were made to improve service and financial planning (as part of a leadership development programme), commercial astuteness, staff engagement, and community engagement

Taking the findings into account, it is recommended the following activities are merged into the PRISM business case:

- Delivery of further Public Realm Services transformation and savings through the current ‘in house’ delivery model as recommended by the soft market test exercise.
- A change programme to bridge the gaps identified by the readiness assessment. The programme would run across Environment and focus on organisational culture, behaviours, leadership, and commercial skills.
- Only after PRISM has been completed and the change programme implemented, should options for externalisation through a Controlled company be considered – and this would be subject to further cabinet decision at that time.

PRISM Implementation

The following actions are proposed in the PRISM business case:

- **The implementation of a new Target Operating Model (TOM)** across Environment that will remove vertical ‘barriers’ that currently exist between services, and replace these with a ‘horizontally’ focussed structure, that brings together similar and related activity. This restructure will result in a significant re-shaping of the management model whilst minimising the impact on front line services. The model achieves the savings target through the reduction of the organisation by approximately 53 posts. The majority of these posts will be from management and supervisory roles, to minimise the impact on front line services, but there are some productivity gains that have been identified through the project in the refuse, street cleaning and grounds maintenance services that will for example reduce the number of refuse collection teams, and the vehicles used by the teams.
- **A re-shaping of Service Delivery to unify ‘on street’ services** increasing ‘eyes and ears’ on the street with the capability and capacity to deal with issues effectively – whether this is immediate resolution or intelligent hand-off to the team or individual best placed to fix it. The

project will create multifunctional roles to deal with information gathering, and straightforward enforcement, with the staff developing a detailed knowledge of the activities taking place at a local level.

- **A significant business process re-engineering exercise and implementation of a common technology platform** to align with the Target Operating Model. The technology will build upon back office and mobile systems already successfully implemented within Public Realm Services and will allow the service to respond to, and deal with the broad range of issues they face on a day-to-day basis. Service Delivery teams supported by an appropriate mobile device will be able to receive and update requests from the public, access and complete electronic forms and access inspection reports and other data that supports them in delivering their service
- **Greater information and transparency to residents and local businesses** by closer integration between the new back office systems and customer facing channels (face to face, telephone, web, MyHarrow).

Consultation with Staff and the Trade Unions

The GMB and UNISON were invited to provide formal comments on the Full Business Case. In addition a number of individual employees and groups of staff have provided comments on the full business case to the project team. The comments are summarised below.

Trade Union comments on the draft full business case:

- Challenging the success described for previous transformation schemes, and the processes used during implementation e.g. in placing staff into the new posts.
- Disagreement about some of the descriptions of current service arrangements.
- Questioning some of the project teams' consultations especially advice sought from professional outside bodies.
- Challenging the ability to apply fixed work planning to professional services e.g. set times for appointments.
- Noting that the income raising benefits of some of the services have not been referred to in the full business case, and risk being lost due to the reduction of posts.
- Support for services seeking new opportunities to raise income.
- Suggestion that no equalities impacts assessments have been produced, and because there has not been a new staff structure

developed yet it is not possible to comment on equalities issues with regard to workforce changes.

- Suggestion that a new structure exists but has not been disclosed.
- Suggestions made about where some functions might be better placed in the blocks of functions set out in the target operating model.
- No reference made to ongoing costs from previous transformation projects.
- Concern about future opportunities for cost savings being indicated in the proposal, on top of the significant savings set out in this project.
- Concern that the proposal reinstates some roles deleted by previous transformation projects.
- Concern about the proposal to reduce the number of refuse collection teams.
- Preference for in house services over externalised alternatives.
- Recognition that social enterprises have provided successful outcomes in some instances, but not a good solution for Harrow.
- Support for the seeking legal advice obtained by the project team on alternative delivery models.
- While recognising that there had been engagement with staff and trade unions in developing the full business case, concern expressed that information on the project has not reached all staff.
- Concern about tracking of issues raised by staff during the development of the full business case.
- Agreement with the social enterprise readiness assessment that the organisation is not ready.
- The alternative delivery model in the proposed form is not supported.
- Negative comments about of senior management and the ability of the organisation to achieve the required culture changes set out in the project.
- Support for the need to change due to financial budgetary impacts and to improve and target service delivery.
- Concern about loss of knowledge and skills that will result from the loss of posts and the restructure.

Comments from employees:

- Some very detailed suggestions for editing and amending the full business case generally in support of the current services, structures and ways of working.
- Suggestions made about where some functions might be better placed in the blocks of functions set out in the target operating model.
- Concern that the target operating model has not captured all of the service functions currently provided by Environment.
- Suggestion that the reduction of posts could be achieved without the transformation and change of roles.
- Concern about the loss of professional integrity.
- Concern about the fragmentation of some of the current roles and the subsequent redistribution of the work undertaken.
- Concern to ensure that income generation schemes are protected through the changes.

Financial Implications

The net financial benefits are evaluated in detail in the Full Business Case document.

The key highlights are as follows:

- Savings of £1.850m full year (£1.500m in 2013/14 and a further £0.350m in 2014/15)
- Total FBC & implementation costs: £4.353m (Capita £2.743m, Council £1.610m – this includes a redundancy provision of £1.150m)
- Ongoing costs (per annum): £0.047m
- Net benefit over 5 years: £4.328m.
- Net benefit over 10 years: £13.300m

The implementation costs are budgeted in the 2012/13 MTFs revenue and BTP capital programme. If the full redundancy provision is used, then an additional requirement of £0.4m will be required from contingency.

The savings put forward in the 2012-13 MTFs in autumn 2011 are based on the current employee and contractual terms and therefore does not include the savings relating to the terms and conditions (T&C) that have just recently been agreed. Based on the information available to date the T&C savings are currently estimated at £0.2m. Once the T&C savings are agreed the above savings will be adjusted accordingly.

Using the MRP model and assuming the full redundancy provision is used, the project will pay back in Year 2014/15. This is detailed in the MRP cashflow section in FBC

Performance Issues

The Environment Division provides a range of frontline services that are important to public satisfaction with the Council. The current performance of the services is mixed. Issues with performance have been identified through this project and the proposals will address a number of the current performance gaps.

Environmental Impact

The Environment division provides or leads for the Council on a number of functions concerning environmental stewardship, climate change mitigation, energy consumption, and waste management. The importance of maintaining a high standard for these functions is recognised in the model being proposed.

Risk Management Implications

The full business case includes a risk assessment.

Failure to implement this project and achieve the savings will have a significant impact on the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.

Equalities implications

Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes

The project has included the production of two Equalities Impacts Assessments to date, one at the start of the project and one for the production of the full business case.

Implementation of the project will involve a further risk assessment once the business processes have been designed and once the new structures have been developed, to assess the impact on staff and external service users.

Corporate Priorities

The Environment Division contributes to all of the Council's Corporate Priorities but especially "Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe". The proposal set out in this report sets out a new way of providing the services that contribute to achieving this priority while contributing annual savings of up to £1.85 million, agreed previously in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 31 August 2012		
Name: Stephen Dorrian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 4 September 2012		

Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name: Liz Defries.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Divisional Director Partnership, Development and Performance
Date: 4 September 2012		

Section 5 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: John Edwards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Divisional Director (Environmental Services)
Date: 31 August 2012		

Section 6 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: John Edwards Divisional Director Environment Services

Background Papers: None

**Call-In Waived by the
Chairman of Overview
and Scrutiny
Committee**

NOT APPLICABLE

[Call in applies]

TEMPLATE 2 - Full Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

In order to carry out this assessment, it is important that you have completed the EqIA E-learning Module and read the Corporate Guidelines on EqIAs. Please refer to these to assist you in completing this form and assessment.

What are the proposals being assessed? (Note: 'proposal' includes a new policy, policy review, service review, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure)	The Full Business Case (FBC) for PRISM (Public Realm Integrated Services Model)
Which Directorate / Service has responsibility for this?	Environment & Enterprise
Name and job title of lead officer	John Edwards
Name & contact details of the other persons involved in the EqIA:	John Edwards, Jerry Hickman, Finlay Flett, Dave Eaglesham, Dave Masters, Andrew Smith, Balraj Sandhu (Capita), Geoff Allen (Capita)
Date of assessment:	25 July 2012

Stage 1: Overview

<p>1. What are the aims, objectives, and desired outcomes of your proposals? (Explain proposals e.g. reduction / removal of service, deletion of posts, changing criteria etc)</p>	<p>The aim of the PRISM business case is to identify how services across Public Realm Services (Waste, Street Cleansing & Grounds Maintenance), Community Safety Services and Highways can be delivered more efficiently through restructuring of departments by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving towards horizontal functions rather vertical service lines • Merging of services (and where applicable, removal of services) • Moving towards a commissioning model • Using technology to support the organisational and service changes • Assessing whether services can be delivered more efficiently through an alternative delivery model
--	--

	<p>The target is to meet the MTFS savings target of £1,800,000 per annum with these interventions.</p>
<p>2. What factors / forces could prevent you from achieving these aims, objectives and outcomes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workforce do not support the changes to the organisation or processes • The wide range of stakeholders do not fully engage with the process • Reduction in service performance, or fluctuation in service delivery • The technology is not used to its full potential to deliver the benefits • The organisational change is not embraced and embedded in the Service
<p>3. Who are the customers? Who will be affected by this proposal? For example who are the external/internal customers, communities, partners, stakeholders, the workforce etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are universal services, and the customers are therefore the residents and businesses of Harrow. Census data is used as the source of customer demographic information for residents. The last census was conducted in March 2011, so population estimates by age and gender are very current. Not all data has been published, so 2001 data is used where necessary (and noted as such). Harrow Vitality Profiles (2009-10) are used as the source of information about business activity in the borough • The entire workforce will potentially be affected by these changes (from Head of Service through to operators on the front line). The extent of these changes will only be known at the next stage of the business case i.e. the development of an FBC (Full Business Case)
<p>4. Is the responsibility shared with another department, authority or organisation? If so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who are the partners? • Who has the overall responsibility? 	<p>Yes. There is a dependency on Corporate Resources for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HR support • Finance for information • Access Harrow as front end for customers and through Web Team for website access
<p>4a. How are/will they be involved in this assessment?</p>	<p>Overall responsibility lies with Environment Services N/A</p>

Stage 2: Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data

5. What information is available to assess the impact of your proposals? Include the actual data, statistics and evidence (including full references) reviewed to determine the potential impact on each equality group (protected characteristic). This can include results from consultations and the involvement tracker, customer satisfaction surveys, focus groups, research interviews, staff surveys, workforce profiles, service users profiles, local and national research, evaluations etc

(Where possible include data on the nine protected characteristics. Where you have gaps, you may need to include this as an action to address in the action plan)

Environment Services are universal services that are provided to all sections of the community – residents, businesses, visitors and staff – having a major impact on the overall satisfaction levels for council services. The services are also central to the delivery of the council's corporate vision of cleaner, safer streets. The services that will be impacted by this project are:

- § Public Realm Services (Waste, Street Cleansing & Grounds Maintenance)
- § Community Safety Services
- § Highways

During the Outline Business Case (OBC) stage there has been:

A review of service data captured using the systems implemented during the earlier Waste and Streets projects

APSE have been engaged to source benchmarking information when assessing new models of operation

The implementation of the technology for Waste during 2009 and early 2010 delivered improvements to both Public Realm Services (PRS) and residents of Harrow through the dissemination of 'real time' information both via Access Harrow and the Council Website. During the development of that project 'Customer Journey mapping' was used to inform the way residents perceived the sharing of information with them and lessons learnt were factored into the solution. This was a key way of ensuring that customer feedback was considered during the development and implementation of service development programmes.

The Waste Project won five prestigious National awards, including one relating to customer contact. The approach that won this award will be replicated in this proposed project. Staff within the service will be engaged at the earliest time when approval is received and any input and feedback will be incorporated into the solution. Feedback obtained during training was also incorporated into the post go live support offered to staff. This was important for on going development of staff and will form a central part of on going service delivery.

The Public Realm Transformation project built upon this success by providing accurate and real time information regarding Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance work schedules (which inform residents of scheduled day of service) and Service Request visibility (customers can see progress on issues that they have raised). This information is now made available via Access Harrow, the Council Website and via the new Citizen Portal.

Key statistics regarding performance and structure are as follows:

Public Realm: NI195: Street cleanliness: 6% (this measures the percentage of land that is not cleaned to standards)

Waste: Household recycling: 48% (this measures the percentage of household waste that is recycled)

Community Safety

THNM/Civil Engineering:

% of street lights functioning at any one time

Average time taken to repair street lights, number of working days.

(This is general maintenance by Harrow's contractor, not cable faults which are the responsibility of the Electricity Supply company, UK Power Networks)

NI168 Principal roads where maintenance should be considered

NI 169 Non-principal classified roads where maintenance should be considered

The Service currently employs 512fte staff.

Service Users. These are universal services that are provided to all sections of the community. The

population of Harrow has risen by 15.6% since the last census in 2001 to 239,100 (from 206,800), which is the highest recorded level of population for the borough, and a bigger rise than projection models predicted.

Category	Group	2011 Census
Total	Population	239,100
Households	No. of households	84,300
	Average household size	2.8

Service Users:

Comparing our borough to London as a whole, Harrow can be defined as having a higher proportion of residents aged over 50, more young people (aged 5-19), and relatively less middle aged (aged 25-49) compared to London as a whole.

Category	Group	2011 Census
Age	Infants: 0-4	15,900
	Children: 5-14	29,000
	Young adults/teens:15-19	15,100
	Adults 20-29	35,400
	Adults 30-39	36,700
	Adults 40-49	32,900
	Adults 50-59	28,300
	Adults 60-64	12,000
	Adults of retirement age 65+	33,600

Employees:

Age Range	Payband						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Under 16	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
16 to 24	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8
25 to 44	36%	34%	33%	20%	0%	0%	136
45 to 64	60%	65%	67%	80%	100%	0%	254
65 +	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
Unknown	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	398

Service Users:

Harrow has a high proportion of residents who considered themselves to be in 'good health' in the 12 months prior to the 2001 Census, at 72.1 per cent. 15 per cent of people in the borough consider themselves to have a long-term illness, which limits the daily activities or work that they can do.

Category	Group	2001 Census
Long-term illness	Households with one or more persons with a limiting long-term illness	24,235
Disability Living Allowance	Number of people in Harrow who are recipients of Disability Living Allowance (DLA) in February 2009 (Source: Harrow vitality Profile)	7,600

Employees:

Disability	Payband						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Yes	3%	3%	5%	0%	0%	0%	12
No	97%	97%	95%	100%	100%	0%	397
Unknown	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	409

Service Users:

Gender Reassignment

Disability (including carers of disabled people)

There are slightly more females than males (50.6% vs. 49.4%).

Category	Group	2011 Census
Gender	Male	118,000
	Female	121,000

Employees:

No data available

Service Users:

Category	Group	2001 Census
Marriage / household composition	Married couple households: No children	8,207
	Married couple households: With dependent children	16,775
	Married couple households: All children non-dependent	6,005
	Co-habiting couple households: No children	2,755
	Co-habiting couple households: With dependent children	1,354
	Co-habiting couple households: All children non-dependent	182
	Lone parent households: With dependent children	4,411
	Lone parent households: All children non-dependent	3,107
	One person pensioner households	10,846
Other one person households	9,859	

Employees:

No data available

Service Users:

These are universal services that are provided to all sections of the community. There is no data available about the pregnancy and maternity profile of the users of any of the services.

Employees:

No data available

Service Users:

The 2001 Census highlighted the cultural diversity of Harrow. Harrow is ranked fifth nationally, based on the proportion of (non-white) ethnic group residents.

Category	Group	2001 Census
Ethnicity	White	
	British	103,207
	Irish	9,057
	Other	9,279
	Mixed	
	Mixed: White and Black Caribbean	1,371
	Mixed: White and Black African	633
	Mixed: White and Asian	2,018
	Mixed: Other	1,818
	Asian or Asian British	
	Indian	45,310
	Pakistani	4,317
	Bangladeshi	953
Other Asian	10,734	
Black or Black British		
Caribbean	6,116	
African	5,656	
Other Black	931	

	Chinese	2,567
	Other ethnic group	2,847

Employees:

Ethnic Group	Payband						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
White	71%	68%	81%	75%	100%	0%	71%
BAME	25%	25%	11%	25%	0%	0%	23%
Unknown	4%	7%	8%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Unclassified	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%

NB: 'BAME' (Black, Asian and minority ethnic) comprises Black, Asian, Mixed, Chinese and Other
 'White' comprises 'White - British', 'White - Irish' and 'White - Other' classifications

Service Users:

In 2001 Harrow had the highest level of religious diversity in England & Wales.

Category	Group	2001 Census
Religion	Christian	97,799
	Buddhist	1,390
	Hindu	40,548
	Jewish	13,112
	Muslim	14,915
	Sikh	2,073
	Other religions	4,208
	No religion	18,674
Religion not stated		14,095

Employees:

No data available

Service Users:

These are universal services that are provided to all sections of the community. There is no data available about the sex / gender profile of the users of any of the services.

Employees:

Gender	Payband						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Female	10%	16%	24%	0%	0%	0%	52
Male	90%	84%	76%	100%	100%	0%	357
Unknown	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	409

Service Users:

These are universal services that are provided to all sections of the community. There is no data available about the sexual orientation profile of the users of any of the services.

Employees:

No data available

44 Sexual Orientation

Businesses

There were 4,819 businesses paying business rates to Harrow Council in July 2009. The total number of businesses paying business rates decreased by 0.7% (33) between September 2005 and July 2009

23% of Harrow's businesses (1,095) are located in Greenhill ward which includes Harrow Town Centre.

The highest concentrations are around the town centres. Greenhill in particular had 217.6 businesses per 1,000 households – over 2.5 times the rate of the next highest ward, Edgware. Kenton East had less than

1% of all Harrow's businesses

The central strip of the borough had the most businesses whilst the west and south-east of the borough had particularly few. This indicates areas with fewer opportunities for local employment and commercial services for residents.

Category	Group	2009-10 Vitality Profiles
Business Activity	Businesses paying business rates to Harrow Council (July 2009)	4,819

See section 5

7. Have you undertaken any consultation on your proposals? (this may include consultation with staff, members, unions, community / voluntary groups, stakeholders, residents and service users)

Yes	No
-----	----

NOTE: If you have not undertaken any consultation as yet, you should consider whether you need to. For example, if you have insufficient data/information for any of the protected characteristics and you are **unable** to assess the potential impact, you may want to consult with them on your proposals as how they will affect them. Any proposed consultation needs to be **completed before progressing** with the rest of the EqIA.

Guidance on consultation/community involvement toolkit can be accessed via the link below
http://harrowhub/info/200195/consultation/169/community_involvement_toolkit

Who was consulted?	What consultation methods were used?	What do the results show about the impact on different equality groups (protected characteristics)?	What action are you going to take as a result of the consultation? This may include revising your proposals, steps to mitigate any adverse impact. <i>(Also Include these in the Improvement Action Plan at Stage 5)</i>
Staff	A level of analysis has already been undertaken to inform the OBC. This includes: DILO (day in the life of) analysis	Consultation thus far has not indicated that there would be a particular impact on any of the different equality groups. We are however continuing to listen to	If the consultation identifies any impact on particular equality groups we shall review our proposals and take steps to mitigate any adverse impact

	<p>to see how operatives undertake the services</p> <p>Workshops and information sharing sessions for staff groups</p> <p>Technology review (what and how current technology is used)</p> <p>As the FBC stage progresses there is ongoing consultation with staff and trade unions through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § An Employee Forum specifically set-up for the Project that includes representation from staff, management and trade unions § All staff are being communicated with regularly via a newsletter, staff briefings, and regular team meetings, and they are being encouraged to feed back their views and ideas on the proposals § A range of workshops to identify 'As is' processes and the implications of any of the proposed changes 	<p>feedback and monitor this and will then respond appropriately.</p> <p>Consultation thus far has indicated that a key concern in terms of impact on equality groups is the impact of the workforce transferring to another employer who may have less effective equality policies and procedures than Harrow Council. We are continuing to listen to feedback and monitor this and will respond appropriately.</p>	<p>Through the provisions of TUPE it should be possible to protect equality groups in the current workforce and in future employment.</p> <p>If a social enterprise proves to be the preferred model this should by its very nature seek to focus on its impact on all members of staff, service users and the community and all equality groups with each of these</p>
--	---	--	---

Managers	<p>on service delivery</p> <p>The project has been a standing item on the Departmental Management Team meeting, together with holding a project Steering Group to discuss progress on the business case.</p> <p>A level of analysis has already been undertaken to inform the OBC. This includes: Agreeing the list of services provided by the service areas (undertaken with Service Managers)</p> <p>Review of organisational structures with Heads of Service and Divisional Director</p>	<p>Consultation thus far has not indicated that there would be a particular impact on any of the different equality groups. We are however continuing to listen to feedback and monitor this and will then respond appropriately</p>	<p>If the consultation identifies any impact on particular equality groups we shall review our proposals and take steps to mitigate any adverse impact</p>
Trades Unions	<p>Formal consultation meetings with the trades unions have been set-up and are ongoing in the form of special Department Joint Committee meetings</p>	<p>Consultation thus far has not indicated that there would be a particular impact on any of the different equality groups. We are however continuing to listen to feedback and monitor this and will then respond appropriately</p>	<p>If the consultation identifies any impact on particular equality groups we shall review our proposals and take steps to mitigate any adverse impact</p>
Service Users	<p>At this stage service users have not been consulted but during implementation if there are any impacts on service delivery there</p>		<p>If any consultation identifies any further impact on specific equality groups we shall review our proposals and take further steps to mitigate any</p>

	will be consultation via: § Residents Associations § Neighbourhood Champions § Police And, again if there are any changes to service delivery, we will use the Communications Team to link into regular feedback mechanisms that are circulated to residents			adverse impact
--	--	--	--	----------------

Stage 3: Assessing Impact and Analysis

8. What does your information tell you about the impact on different groups? Consider whether the evidence shows potential for differential impact, if so state whether this is an adverse or positive impact? How likely is this to happen? How you will mitigate/remove any adverse impact?

Protected Characteristic	Positive	Adverse	Explain what this impact is, how likely it is to happen and the extent of impact if it was to occur.	What measures can you take to eliminate or reduce the adverse impact(s)? E.g. consultation, research, implement equality monitoring etc (Also include these in the Improvement Action Plan at Stage 5)
Age (including carers of young/older people)			<p>The above staff profile statistics reveal that there a significant proportion of staff are in the age range 45-64 (64%); any reduction in staff will inevitably have an impact on this group of the workforce. The extent of this impact is unknown at this stage but will be monitored as the proposals for any new staff structure are developed.</p> <p>Take up and use of new technology may be impacted by older staff who may not be as technology literate as younger staff members.</p>	<p>The Council Protocol for Managing Organisational Change will be followed throughout any staff restructuring process.</p> <p>The need to address this impact will be built into the Training Strategy and during training steps will be taken to provide additional support for any staff who have difficulty adapting to new technology.</p>

			<p>A key concern regarding impact on all equality groups is the impact of the workforce transferring to another employer who may have less effective equality policies and procedures than Harrow Council. This will be particularly the case for Age as the above staff profile statistics reveal that there a significant proportion of staff are in the age range 45-64 (64%);</p>	<p>Through the provisions of TUPE it should be possible to protect equality groups in the current workforce and in future employment. If a social enterprise proves to be the preferred model this should by its very nature seek to focus on its impact on all members of staff, service users and the community and all equality groups</p>
Disability (including carers disabled people)			<p>The above staff profile statistics reveal that the number of staff with a disability is low (3%) but nevertheless the take up and use of new technology may be impacted by individual factors.</p> <p>A key concern regarding impact on all equality groups is the impact of the workforce transferring to another employer who may have less effective equality policies and procedures than Harrow Council. This will be particularly the case for Disability as the above staff profile statistics reveal that the number of staff with a disability is low (3%) but nevertheless the take up and use of new technology may be impacted by individual factors</p>	<p>The need to address this impact will be built into the Training Strategy and during training steps will be taken to provide additional support for any staff who have difficulty adapting to new technology.</p> <p>Through the provisions of TUPE it should be possible to protect equality groups in the current workforce and in future employment. If a social enterprise proves to be the preferred model this should by its very nature seek to focus on its impact on all members of staff, service users and the community and all equality groups.</p>
Gender			<p>There is no impact expected in this category</p>	
Reassignment			<p>There is no impact expected in this category</p>	
Marriage and Civil Partnership			<p>There is no impact expected in this category</p>	
Pregnancy and Maternity			<p>The above staff profile statistics reveal a relatively good representation within the workforce by</p>	<p>The Council Protocol for Managing Organisational Change will be followed throughout any staff</p>
Race				

			<p>individuals who have identified as BAME, although this is predominantly the case in the lower paybands. Any staff reorganisation should ensure that BAME individuals are not disadvantaged in any way during the process</p> <p>A key concern regarding impact on all equality groups is the impact of the workforce transferring to another employer who may have less effective equality policies and procedures than Harrow Council. This will be particularly the case for Race as the</p>	<p>restructuring process.</p> <p>Through the provisions of TUPE it should be possible to protect equality groups in the current workforce and in future employment. If a social enterprise proves to be the preferred model this should by its very nature seek to focus on its impact on all members of staff, service users and the community and all equality groups.</p>
Religion or Belief			There is no impact expected in this category	
Sex			There is no impact expected in this category	
Sexual orientation			There is no impact expected in this category	
50 Other (please state)				
<p>9. Cumulative impact – Are you aware of any cumulative impact? For example, when conducting a major review of services. This would mean ensuring that you have sufficient relevant information to understand the cumulative effect of all of the decisions.</p> <p>Example: A local authority is making changes to four different policies. These are funding and delivering social care, day care, and respite for carers and community transport. Small changes in each of these policies may disadvantage disabled people, but the cumulative effect of changes to these areas could have a significant effect on disabled people's participation in public life. The actual and potential effect on equality of all these proposals, and appropriate mitigating measures, will need to be considered to ensure that inequalities between</p>			<p>Due regard will need to be given to ensure there is no overlap in any changes occurring as a result of the review of Staff Terms and Conditions</p> <p>The project in itself will have a significant impact on the way services are organised and delivered (with positive outcomes anticipated) and this impact is being monitored through the BTP governance at Board and Project Group level</p>	

<p>different equality groups, particularly in this instance for disabled people, have been identified and do not continue or widen. This may include making a decision to spread the effects of the policy elsewhere to lessen the concentration in any one area.</p>	<p>10. How do your proposals contribute towards the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), which requires the Council to have due regard to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different groups.</p> <p>(Include all the positive actions of your proposals, for example literature will be available in large print, Braille and community languages, flexible working hours for parents/carers, IT equipment will be DDA compliant etc)</p>		
<p>Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010</p>	<p>Advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups</p>	<p>Foster good relations between people from different groups</p>	<p>Are there any actions you can take to meet the PSED requirements? <i>(List these here and include them in the Improvement Action Plan at Stage 5)</i></p>
<p>51 compliance with Council and wider policies eg PMOC, TUPE</p>	<p>Standardised methods of contact will make it easier for people from all groups to contact the council about these services.</p> <p>Greater community involvement through participation in a social enterprise model</p>	<p>Unification of 4 service areas will bring groups of staff together into a more unified group.</p> <p>Greater community involvement through participation in a social enterprise model</p>	<p>The project is underpinned by strong project processes that are already embedded throughout the Council via the Business Transformation Partnership. This will cover change management, risk management, communications and quality assurance.</p> <p>Working with the Business Transformation Partnership programme strategy, which is designed to ensure that best practice is applied throughout the programme's life span.</p> <p>Equalities will be embedded</p>

	<p>impact and/or plans to monitor the impact. (explain this in 12a below)</p> <p>Outcome 4 – Stop and rethink: when there is potential for serious adverse impact or disadvantage to one or more protected groups. (You are encouraged to seek Legal Advice about the potential for unlawful conduct under equalities legislation)</p>
<p>12a. If your EqIA is assessed as outcome 3 or have ticked 'yes' in Q11, explain your justification with full reasoning to continue with your proposals.</p>	<p>No significant adverse equality impacts have been identified. There is a need to monitor the impact on the workforce of any staff reorganisation on the areas of Age, Disability and Race, but no indication that an adverse impact is to be expected and this situation will be monitored as the project progresses and by adherence to the Council's Protocol for Managing Organisational Change during the implementation of any restructuring.</p> <p>In the event of any transfer of services to an alternative provider, staff transferring would be subject to TUPE and the quality of service provision to Equality groups would be protected through the provisions of procurement/contract documentation.</p>

Stage 5: Making Adjustments (Improvement Action Plan)

<p>13. List below any actions you plan to take as a result of this impact assessment. This should include any actions identified throughout the EqIA.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="742 78 774 291">51 3</th> <th data-bbox="742 291 774 1064">Area of potential adverse impact e.g. Race, Disability</th> <th data-bbox="742 1064 774 1388">Action proposed</th> <th data-bbox="742 1388 774 1713">Desired Outcome</th> <th data-bbox="742 1713 774 2038">Target Date</th> <th data-bbox="742 2038 774 2188">Lead Officer</th> <th data-bbox="742 2188 774 2228">Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	51 3	Area of potential adverse impact e.g. Race, Disability	Action proposed	Desired Outcome	Target Date	Lead Officer	Progress							
51 3	Area of potential adverse impact e.g. Race, Disability	Action proposed	Desired Outcome	Target Date	Lead Officer	Progress									

Age	<p>Ensure selection process does not discriminate or preclude any age demographic for being considered or appointed to the new organisation based on age. All applicants will be assessed against agreed criteria (including Job profile matching and Qualification criteria)</p> <p>Where necessary, additional coaching and support will be offered to allow any staff who feel disadvantaged</p>	<p>Positive impact reflected in an analysis of the workforce profile after any reorganisation has been concluded</p>	<p><i>Subject to decision on FBC</i></p>	<p><i>John Edwards</i></p>	
Disability	<p>Ensure selection process does not discriminate or preclude any age demographic for being considered or appointed to the new organisation because of disability. All applicants will be assessed against agreed criteria (including Job profile matching and Qualification criteria)</p> <p>Where necessary, additional coaching and support will be offered to allow any staff who feel</p>	<p>Positive impact reflected in an analysis of the workforce profile after any reorganisation has been concluded</p>	<p><i>Subject to decision on FBC</i></p>	<p><i>John Edwards</i></p>	

	disadvantaged		
--	---------------	--	--

Stage 6 - Monitoring

The full impact of the decision may only be known after the proposals have been implemented, it is therefore important to ensure effective monitoring measures are in place to assess the impact.

<p>14. How will you monitor the impact of the proposals once they have been implemented? How often will you do this? <i>(Also Include in Improvement Action Plan at Stage 5)</i></p>				
<p>15. Do you currently monitor this function / service? Do you know who your service users are?</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="406 846 486 1108">Yes</td> <td data-bbox="406 589 486 846"></td> <td data-bbox="406 331 486 589">No</td> </tr> </table>	Yes		No
Yes		No		
<p>16. What monitoring measures need to be introduced to ensure effective monitoring of your proposals? <i>(Also Include in Improvement Action Plan at Stage 5)</i></p>	<p>Review of workforce profile during and after the reorganisation process.</p> <p>Review of workforce profile during and after any new arrangements for delivery of services</p> <p>Review of impact on Business Demographic during the development of the new Target Operating Model and Business Process Reengineering</p>			
<p>17. How will the results of any monitoring be analysed, reported and publicised? <i>(Also Include in Improvement Action Plan at Stage 5)</i></p>	<p>This will be reviewed dependant on the outcome of any reorganisation process. At this stage it is too early to make assumptions.</p> <p>This will be reviewed dependant on the outcome of any further work during the FBC and on the nature of any alternative delivery arrangements</p>			
<p>18. Have you received any complaints or compliments about the policy, service, function, project or proposals being assessed? If so, provide details.</p>	<p>No</p>			

Stage 7 – Reporting outcomes

The completed EqIA must be attached to all committee reports and a summary of the key findings included in the relevant section within them.

EqIA's will also be published on the Council's website and made available to members of the public on request.

<p>19. Summary of the assessment</p> <p>NOTE: This section can also be used in your reports, however you must ensure the full EqIA is available as a background paper for the decision makers (Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny, CSB etc)</p> <p>55</p> <p>What are the key impacts – both adverse and positive? Are there any particular groups affected more than others? Do you suggest proceeding with your proposals although an adverse impact has been identified? If yes, what are your justifications for this? What course of action are you advising as a result of this EqIA?</p>	<p>The aim of the PRISM business case is to identify how services across Public Realm Services (Waste, Street Cleansing & Grounds Maintenance), Community Safety Services and Highways can be delivered more efficiently through restructuring of departments by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Moving towards horizontal functions rather vertical service linesMerging of services (and where applicable, removal of services)Moving towards a commissioning modelUsing technology to support the organisational and service changesAssessing whether services can be delivered more efficiently through an alternative delivery model <p>The target is to meet the MTFs savings target of £1,800,000 per annum with these interventions.</p> <p>The anticipated outcomes are a significant reduction in the costs of providing these services, which will in turn assist the Council to meet its budget targets, and an overall improved coordination of service delivery.</p> <p>The EqIA has not revealed any definitive adverse impacts other than the need to monitor the effect of any staff restructuring, particularly in the areas of Age and Disability. The usual BTP governance and adherence to the Council's Protocol for Managing Organisational Change (PMOC) should more than adequately ensure that there are in practice no adverse equalities impacts.</p>
--	--

<p>20. How will the impact assessment be publicised? E.g. Council website, intranet, forums, groups etc</p>	<p>§ Council intranet § Staff forums etc § Project newsletter</p>
<p>Stage 8 - Organisational sign Off (to be completed by Chair of Departmental Equalities Task Group) The completed EqIA needs to be sent to the chair of your Departmental Equalities Task Group (DETG) to be signed off.</p>	
<p>21. Which group or committee considered, reviewed and agreed the EqIA and the Improvement Action Plan?</p>	<p>DETG for Environment</p>
<p>Signed: (Lead officer completing EqIA)</p>	<p>John Edwards Signed: (Chair of DETG) Anu Singh</p>
<p>Date:</p>	<p>Date:</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank