

Business Case

ETE BP - Highways Service Transformation (B/R.6.207)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Highways Service Transformation (B/R.6.207)		
Saving	£500,000	Business Planning Reference	(B/R.6.207)
Business Planning Brief Description	Significant savings will be made as part of the new Highways contract, which started in July 2017, from further integration with our contractor and new ways of working.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Christine May, Interim Service Director: Infrastructure Management & Operations		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

The Council wished to develop an integrated partnership with our suppliers, and this is at the core of the new Highways Services Contract. Our new highways integrated partnership with Skanska has the flexibility to evolve over the life of the contract to reflect Cambridgeshire's emerging changing need. This will enable financial savings to be achieved through integrated teams, breaking down traditional client/provider boundaries, which may have inhibited change previously. Our previous Highways contract had come to an end and we were required to undertake a competitive procurement process as part of this.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Approach

Aims / Objectives

The Council aims to ensure that this integrated partnership approach with Skanska will be established from the very start of the contract and will mature over the life of the Contract.

This will enable financial savings to be achieved through integrated teams, breaking down traditional client/provider boundaries, which may have inhibited change previously, through a cultural change process. Also the business model will be enhanced by Service Improvement Plans and Benefit Cards and suggestions, offered during the procurement process.

To enable maximum benefits of a successful long term strategic partnership, an initial contract term of ten years has been selected with an option to extend for a further five years. However a contract reduction mechanism is also available that could potentially reduce the contract term as a result of poor performance.

Project Overview - What are we doing

This is the revenue element of the £2.2m savings sought in year two of the new highway contract. 10 of the 44 benefit cards relate to measures to achieve savings for 18/19 (a mix of revenue and capital).

The revenue savings will come from a combination of: re-structuring in conjunction with Skanska and Peterborough City Council; increased use of the Dragon Patcher; capitalising revenue; integrated programming and planning; driving collaboration through operational excellence and the use of a volume based discount mechanism within the new contract.

What assumptions have you made?

That the level of financial savings will be achieved through a more integrated approach

What constraints does the project face?

None identified

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

At present, it is envisaged that savings will be achieved by:

- Negotiating better value from the contract that commenced on 1st July 2017
- Integration of staff / shared management between the authority and the provider
- More efficient processes through closer partnership working between the authority and the provider
- Efficiencies realised through using the Highways Asset Management Plan (HIAMP)
- Use of new technologies and processes (including shared IT) Further ideas that emerge through the service improvement plans and benefit cards offered as part of the Highway service Contract 2017

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

- It is anticipated that the services may evolve throughout the lifetime of the contract.
- The following services are within the scope of the post 2017 Highway Services Contract:
- Design of highways maintenance and improvements for schemes up to design and construction value
- Construction of highways maintenance and improvements for schemes design and construction value
- Structures: provision, improvement and maintenance
- Materials testing and laboratory services
- Consultancy such as studies, feasibility assessment, checking and certification
- Supervision and management of work by others
- Routine maintenance activities including but not limited to drainage cleansing, grass cutting and other horticultural and arboricultural maintenance
- Surveys and traffic counts
- General management and IT systems
- Improvement and maintenance work to existing highways depots and design and works associated with future relocation, rationalisation or new provision
- Bridges management, inspection
- Highways safety inspections
- Highways Development Management
- Rights of Way
- Maintenance of highways asset records
- Road safety education and engineering
- Transport Strategy Development
- Provision of an Integrated Network Management Centre
- Highways condition surveys
- Flood and water management and drainage approvals
- Co-location at Vantage House, the new Highways HQ

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

None identified

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None identified

Risks

None identified

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

Road users across Cambridgeshire and county partners involved in delivering new infrastructure on the highway network.
--

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?
--

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A more closely aligned and integrated highway service.• Increased efficiencies.• Improved customer service.• Improved quality of work.• Increased value for money.• A safe and efficient highway network. |
|--|

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?
--

In theory there should not be any negative impacts, however any new contract requires a bedding in period.
--

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?
--

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

None identified

Business Case

ETE BP - Library Service Transformation (B/R.6.208)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Library Service Transformation (B/R.6.208)		
Saving	£230,000	Business Planning Reference	(B/R.6.208)
Business Planning Brief Description	Changes to make the service financially sustainable and allow reinvestment in the book fund, including income generation and service redesign.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Christine May, Interim Service Director: Infrastructure Management & Operations		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Drivers for transforming the library service in Cambridgeshire include:

- Savings of £230,000 in the 2018/19 business plan
- DCMS guidance, as set out in 'Libraries Deliver: Ambition for Public Libraries in England 2016-2021'
- Improving outcomes for library users and all citizens across Cambridgeshire, including vulnerable groups
- To create a service that is both excellent and as self-sustaining as possible

This Transformation Programme, running from May 2017-May 2018, will initially set out to define the future of Cambridgeshire's Library Service and how it supports the Council's priorities, meets the needs of our citizens, and offers an attractive service to its users.

Alongside developing a clear vision for the future, this programme will explore the ways in which short-term savings and longer-term financial sustainability can be achieved. These options and subsequent proposals will be explored in collaboration with library staff, users and the wider community.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Failure to undertake a successful transformation of Cambridgeshire's Library Service may result in reductions in service provision to meet financial requirements.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

The aims of this Transformation Programme is to create a service that is both excellent and as self-sustaining as possible.

Project Overview - What are we doing

There are a number of workstreams which form the Libraries Transformation Programme. These are:

- Engagement and Consultation
- Needs Analysis
- Library Service Function
- Commissioning and Income Generation
- Technology
- Alternative Delivery Models
- Shared Assets
- Mobile Library Service Review

In August 2017, we began a process of engagement with library users and stakeholders to discuss how we can achieve ongoing financial sustainability while continuing to deliver a service that meets the needs of its users and the community. Subject to the outcome of the engagement process, a set of proposals will be shared with the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee in early December. That will confirm whether a decision is required regarding a public consultation in early 2018 or not.

What assumptions have you made?

None identified

What constraints does the project face?

None identified

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

The Mobile Library Service Review is considering the following options:

- No change.
- Reduce Provision.
- Income Generation
- Alternative Delivery

The Income Generation workstream is considering a range of options, with the likelihood that a mixed portfolio approach will be recommended:

- Public Sector Service Contracts
- Private Sector Service Contracts
- Direct Trading
- Charged-For Services
- ICT Services
- Philanthropy

A range of options is also being considered for the implementation of Automatic Library Opening systems.

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

The County Council has a statutory duty to "provide a 'comprehensive and efficient' library service for all people working, living, or studying full-time in the area who want to make use of it". This Transformation Programme covers the Library Service as a whole.

What is outside of scope?

At this stage, closures of static libraries are not being considered.

Project Dependencies

None identified

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

Title

Increased community leadership of libraries

Increased offer for library users

Library service contributing to corporate priorities

Risks

Title

Savings Target Increases

Automated Library Access System Implementation over budget and not delivered on time

Lack of capacity within CCC

Leaked negative news/comms

Lack of engagement

Transformation Programme does not deliver

Conflicts in income generation opportunities

Savings are prioritised

Limitations on the ability to generate income

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

An assessment will be completed as part of the proposals put forward

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

ETE BP - Consumer information and advice (B/R.6.219)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Consumer information and advice (B/R.6.219)		
Saving	£15,000	Business Planning Reference	B/R 6.219
Business Planning Brief Description	Trading Standards now have an alternative contract in place for the delivery of consumer information and advice. Previous arrangements are no longer needed.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Christine May, Interim Service Director: Infrastructure Management and Operations		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

In 2008/9, the Trading Standards Service drew up SLAs with seven different organisations for the provision of information, advice and mediation services; three of these arrangements have already finished previously and, as such, only four remain with the following local charities:

- Cambridge Family Mediation Service - £4,980 p.a. (£10,610)
- Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum (CHESS) - £1,370 p.a. (£3,170)
- Disability Information Service Huntingdonshire (DISH) - £6,412 p.a. (£15,310)
- Citizens Advice Bureau (Cambridge and Rural) - £13,280 p.a. (£31,440)

Total cost = £26,042

Copies of the SLAs can be found in the documents section.

All of the grants have been reduced over the years (the original allocation is shown in brackets above) in line the council's legal requirement for a balanced budget and in recognition of the fact that the council has no statutory responsibility to provide consumer advice.

Moreover, the consumer landscape has recently changed as a result of Government policy. Most consumer advice and information is now provided by the Citizens Advice Consumer Helpline funded by Government. Consequently, the Trading Standards Service no longer requires these services from the remaining four organisations and it is proposed that the council phases out the provision of these grants over a two year period.

The current business plan proposal is to take a phased approach to the reductions with a £15k reduction in 2018/19 and the remainder of the grants removed in 2019/20.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

The Trading Standards Service would not be able to meet this savings target 2018/19.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

The aim is to ensure that consumers in Cambridgeshire have access to free, independent advice on a range of issues. With the introduction of a Government funded Citizen Advice Consumer Helpline, there is less of a need locally for charities to provide this service as part of an SLA with Trading Standards which, in turn, can redirect funding to other areas of greater need as the council has no statutory duty to directly provide or commission consumer advice

Project Overview - What are we doing

We have undertaken a review of the existing Service Level Agreements (SLAs) with Cambridge Family Mediation Service, Cambridge

Ethnic Community Service, Disability Information Service Huntingdonshire and Citizen Advice Bureau (Cambridge and Rural) to establish the nature of the consumer advice, information and guidance which these charities provide under the terms and conditions of the agreement with Trading Standards. Copies of these SLAs can be found in the documents section.

The review has established that all four organisations are obliged to provide a range of consumer advice services relating to issues such as benefits, debt, education and training, housing, transport, mobility, access, medical, health and signposting to other partners in both the statutory and voluntary sector. Other than a copy of the annual reports, there are no specific records which show the number of individuals who have accessed consumer advice and guidance from 2008 - 2017. It is therefore not possible to evidence whether removing the Trading Standards community grant will have a direct impact on clients in Cambridgeshire in terms of their access to independent consumer advice and guidance.

However, acknowledging that removing an annual grant to a charity can have a negative impact on their financial sustainability, a review of their annual financial reports has also been undertaken. Copies of the financial reports can be found in the documents section.

As per the annual reports, the income of the organisations in question in financial year 2015/16 were as per below (accounts for 16/17 not yet available):

Cambridge Family Mediation Service (charity number 1041476) - £275,770 (up from £251,910 in 14/15).
The organisation is operating with a reserve of approx £76K.

Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum (charity number 04175678) - only required to submit abbreviated accounts due to size - £19,440 cash in bank and in hand (down from £19,584 in 14/15)

Disability Information Services Huntingdonshire (charity number 106172) - £45,900 (down from £55,251 in 14/15). The organisation declared an overspend of £5,961 in 15/16.

Citizen Advice Bureau Cambridge and Rural (charity number 1056102) - £803,244 (down from £960,575 in 14/15).
CAB are operating with a reserve of approx £786K

In view of the annual income figures highlighted above, the probability of putting the financial sustainability of the four charities at risk is assessed as low as the community grant provided by Trading Standards is not substantial. However, to ensure that organisations that support vulnerable and/or minority groups in Cambridgeshire continue to have access to grant funding, the council is now accepting applications to the Innovate and Cultivate Fund which support projects that would make savings for the council by offsetting revenue expenditure.

What assumptions have you made?

There is an assumption that by giving written notice of six months (as per the T&Cs of existing SLA) and by phasing out the community grants over a two year period, the organisations will have time to make appropriate operational decisions and seek alternative funding if required

What constraints does the project face?

With no records confirming the number of clients supported by the four charities via the council's annual community grant, it is not possible to accurately assess community impact

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

None identified

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

None identified

What is outside of scope?

None identified

Project Dependencies

None identified

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None identified

Risks

Title

Lack of political support

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

Cambridge Family Mediation Service
Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum
Disability Information Service Huntingdonshire
Citizen Advice Bureau (Cambridge and Rural)

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Awareness of the opportunity to access Innovate and Cultivate funding from Cambridgeshire County Council

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Withdrawal of Trading Standards community grants will have a negative financial impact on the organisations in question

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

No. However, the proposal is to phase out the community grants over a two year period in order to reduce the impact substantially and to give sufficient advance notification of the reduction/withdrawal.

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Some of the organisations support clients with protected characteristics due to the limited scope of their guidance and advice services. However, the removal of the community grants will not pose a substantial risk to the financial sustainability of these organisations and it is anticipated that they will continue to operate should this proposal be accepted

Business Case

ETE BP - Renegotiation of the Waste PFI contract (B/R.6.302)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Renegotiation of the Waste PFI contract (B/R.6.302)		
Saving	£1,000,000	Business Planning Reference	(B/R.6.302)
Business Planning Brief Description	Transformation Fund investment to achieve the saving in proposal B/R.6.302		
Senior Responsible Officer	Graham Hughes Executive Director Environment and Community Services		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

The Chief Executives of both Amey and Cambridgeshire County Council are committed to making savings from the contract. Terms of Reference have already been agreed for the negotiating group to freely share information, to be open minded and investigate all options, to work in partnership to fairly evaluate all options available in a timely manner, to be mindful of the original commitments to investors and DEFRA and seek their approval for the changes proposed. The negotiating group will meet periodically to identify changes that will deliver the savings required and report back to the Chief Executives of each organisation. Key decisions required by CCC, will be taken by the General Purposes Committee (GPC).

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Approach

Aims / Objectives

Project Overview - What are we doing

What assumptions have you made?

Amey are willing to consider and negotiate, and look at everything in the contract. The fact that the current regulatory environment will stay the same for the remaining term of the contract, which is due to end in 2036, is therefore difficult to assume.

What constraints does the project face?

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

This contract is on a 27-year PFI so there are limited options. The base case is to do nothing and leave the contract as it is. This would result in continually escalating costs, due to changes in waste legislation, the expected continual increase of landfill tax as well as population growth and economic growth increasing the quantity of waste collected.

Beyond this, there are a range of options that include finding an off-taker for the existing product of the MBT, seeking changes in the

process within the MBT to produce more valuable outputs that can then be disposed of via an off-taker, reconsidering the whole operation of the MBT or substantial changes to the structure of the contract with Amey.

There is the option to terminate the contract however there are high costs associated as we will be liable for all unpaid costs for the infrastructure.

Each of these options carries different savings profiles and risks and at this stage, it is proposed that no options be closed down and that the option that ultimately delivers the maximum savings for Cambridgeshire is adopted. More work is required to conclude on what option that is and that work will be steered by GPC.

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

Everything in terms of the contract is in scope, including re-financing, changes to processing methods, all types of waste, reducing the services provided under the contract and the nature of the relationship with Amey. A high-level negotiating group has been set up with senior representatives from both organisations, including the CCC Chief Finance Officer. The negotiating group will be responsible for identifying the changes required to deliver the savings required and confirming the scope in future.

What is outside of scope?

None identified

Project Dependencies

None identified

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None identified

Risks

Title

Changes in regulatory environment.

Financing risk

Inertia risk- for example if Amey are not co-operative

There are a number of parties behind the PFI, such as lenders and DEFRA, so there is a risk that they will not agree

Reputational risk.

Changes in the exchange rate, following the EU referendum

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

No impacts identified

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

B/R.7.120 Highways Development Management - increase income forecast

Project Overview

Project Title	B/R.7.120 Highways Development Management - increase income forecast		
Saving	£200,000	Business Planning Reference	B/R.7.120
Business Planning Brief Description	Increased income from charges made to developers seeking highway agreements. In previous years we have over achieved on our income forecast so this represents a more realistic forecast.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Bob Menzies - Service Director: Strategy and Development		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Due to a large amount of growth, a more realistic forecast has been made on the income that can be achieved due to an increase in service delivery.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Approach

Aims / Objectives

There is no change in service delivery, but instead due to the large amount of growth a more realistic forecast of income has been identified.

Project Overview - What are we doing

N/A

What assumptions have you made?

N/A

What constraints does the project face?

N/A

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

N/A

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

N/A

What is outside of scope?

N/A

Project Dependencies

N/A

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

N/A

Risks

N/A

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

There will be no impact on the community as the service offer is not changing as a result of this proposal.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

ETE BP - Ongoing Concessionary Fares Underspend (B/R.6.105)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Ongoing Concessionary Fares Underspend (B/R.6.105)		
Saving	£400,000	Business Planning Reference	BR 6.105
Business Planning Brief Description	Due to changes in legislation and the increasing pension age, fewer people are eligible for concessionary bus fares - creating a reduced budget requirement in this area.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Bob Menzies - Service Director: Strategy and Development		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

As per the Transport Act 2000, there are two types of concessionary bus fares – statutory concessions (i.e. those which local authorities must provide in accordance with national legislation) and non-statutory, discretionary concessions (i.e. those which local authorities can provide from their own funds if they so wish).

The basic statutory concession in England provides for free bus travel for older and disabled people during off-peak times. The eligible age for the concession is rising to 66 by October 2020 and currently stands at around 62.5. The change in eligibility criteria means a reduction in numbers of pensioners applying for concessionary bus passes which, in turn, reduces the pressure on the council's concessionary fare budget.

The Passenger Transport Service is monitoring bus journeys and applications for concessionary bus passes. Records show that there were 106,157 passes in circulation in 2015 and there are currently 85,394. However, as the team has recently had a change in the software used for data collection, these figures may not be 100% accurate. Nevertheless, they confirm the anticipated drop in application numbers.

At the end of 2015/16, the concessionary fare budget closed with an underspend of around £300K. As this was the first time for this to have happened, no changes were made to the budget at the time but as the same underspend was observed in 2016/17, it appears to be a new pattern of spend. On this basis, a £300K savings figure was agreed for 2017/18 and it is proposed to increase this amount to £400K for 2018/19 as numbers are still reducing.

No policy change is proposed and this initiative will have no adverse impact on customer's access to free bus journeys. Concessionary bus passes will continue to be provided to those who meet the eligibility criteria.

The council will continue to monitor usage and applications made for concessionary bus passes in order that the future budget can be amended in the event that the trend reverses over the coming year.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

The underspend would remain in the concessionary fare budget rather than be used to offset the waste budget

Approach

Aims / Objectives

To adjust the concessionary fare budget to align with current predicted underspend of £400K

Project Overview - What are we doing

The Passenger Transport Service is managing the budget related to concessionary bus fares and as expenditure is demand-led, the service has for a number of years been monitoring customer journeys and applications for concessionary bus passes for those

passengers who meet the eligibility criteria.

As per the updated Transport Act 2000, the eligibility criteria has been amended so that the age related criteria is changed in line with pensionable age and the council consequently has fewer customers who are eligible for a concessionary bus pass.

As a result, there is currently an underspend on concessionary fare budget of £400K and, in line with last year's decision, it is proposed that this underspend is diverted to the waste management budget.

What assumptions have you made?

It is assumed that the current downward trend in application numbers for concessionary bus passes will continue

What constraints does the project face?

The service is demand led and it is difficult to accurately predict customer behaviour and take-up

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

N/A

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

None identified

What is outside of scope?

None identified

Project Dependencies

None identified

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None identified

Risks

Title

Inaccurate prediction of service demand

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

As no policy change is proposed as part of this initiative, there are no adverse impact on customers or communities

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

ETE BP - Move to full cost recovery for non-statutory highway works (B/R.6.213)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Move to full cost recovery for non-statutory highway works (B/R.6.213)		
Saving	£100,000	Business Planning Reference	B/R.6.213
Business Planning Brief Description	Recharging the cost of officer time, not just the actual cost of work, for privately funded or part privately funded highway works		
Senior Responsible Officer	Christine May, Interim Service Director: Infrastructure Management & Operations		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Currently non-statutory privately funded and third party highway works do not cover their full cost, specifically the cost of officer time. The team want to introduce a time recording system and new processes for costing and charging for schemes from the public and third parties such as parishes. The time recording system will also give greater transparency regarding the actual cost of schemes and will enable an accurate quote for work to be provided in advance of a scheme starting. In addition to costs being fully recovered, a stronger understanding of how officer time is spent will support managers in allocating resources and setting service objectives, as well as managing expectations with Members and the public more effectively.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

The service could not accurately track, monitor and charge for these non-statutory schemes.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

- To be able to accurately cost and charge for non-statutory privately funded highway works
- To have a stronger understanding of how officer time is spent in order to support managers in allocating resources and setting service objectives
- To increase transparency with regards to the actual cost of schemes
- To be able to provide an accurate quote for work in advance of it starting
- To be able to manage expectations regarding delivery of the work with applicants.

Project Overview - What are we doing

We will need to work with ETE Committees and engage with all Members regarding this proposal. We will also need to engage with parishes as their costs will increase as a result of this proposal. The implementation of a time-recording system is vital to the success of this proposal and the commercialisation agenda across ETE, therefore early work to investigate the options for this is already underway. We will also need to train and educate staff regarding recording their time and the development of a commercial culture amongst staff will be required to ensure the success of the proposal.

What assumptions have you made?

- Ability to recruit staff to do this work/retain current staff
- That there is a market for a Local Authority to operate in this way.
- That an effective time recording system will be implemented.
- That applicants (Parishes) continue to submit applications for privately funded highway schemes despite the costs increasing.

What constraints does the project face?

- That the time recording system is set up and rolled out so that staff can start to use this system.
- The recruitment and retention of a viable resource pool to deliver schemes.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Do nothing. This would not achieve any savings or other benefits.

2. We could outsource all of the works under the new Highways contract and stipulate that CCC receives a share of the income. A private sector provider could market and generate more income, but we would lose a high degree of Member input and income.
3. CCC could create its own trading arm; a formal consultancy. This could include MID and would generate more income due to the size of the schemes involved. However, a new 10 year highway services contract has recently commenced. Therefore the option now is to look for greater integration with Skanska.
4. We could combine with other neighbouring authorities to work together and deliver this work. This would increase the resilience of the team and create centres of excellence. Work is underway to integrate with Peterborough City Council.
5. The proposed approach, which allows us to generate income to fully recover costs while retaining control and Member input.

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

The rollout and use of a time recording system will initially begin with the Highway Projects and Road Safety team and those teams / members of staff that support the delivery of privately funded local highway schemes (e.g. Policy and Regulation team, Asset Management Team, Traffic Signals team etc.).

There is also scope to include ongoing maintenance (commuted sums) following scheme delivery, this could provide a sustained and increased income, whilst reducing pressure on future maintenance budgets.

This proposal fits into the wider organisational agenda of fully recovering costs and commercialisation.

What is outside of scope?

N/A

Project Dependencies

Title

The time-recording system is a key dependency as it is not possible to go forward with this proposal before that is implemented.

There are also dependencies on partners, such as the contractor/service provider and their supply chain.

There are also links to regulation, as the work of the Policy and Regulation team is statutory.

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None identified

Risks

Title

This is a competitive market, so there is a risk of potential customers choosing other providers.

Possible lack of Member support, as this will affect all of their patches.

Reputational risk

Culture change takes longer to embed than expected which means that income targets are not achieved.

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

The proposal will affect all those that wish to apply for privately funded or third party highway improvement schemes. County Council staff will have to change their mind set and approach to delivering these schemes, ensuring that time is recorded accurately in order to recover the full cost of schemes.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

- Reduced pressure on already stretched budgets, therefore potential for the money to go further.
- Greater transparency regarding small scale highway improvement schemes.
- County staff becoming more commercially minded.
- Increased certainty that schemes will be delivered due to appropriate resource and better programme management.

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

- The cost of schemes to communities will increase.
- Poorer communities may not be able to fund highway improvements.
- Could lead to an increased divide between areas of the county.

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

There are no neutral impacts.

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

The likelihood is that the cost of schemes will increase; therefore some of the more deprived communities may not be able to afford to pay for highway improvement schemes. However there are still other types of funding available through the local transport plan that will ensure the whole county benefits from highway improvements.

Business Case

ETE BP - Street Lighting - contract synergies (B/R.6.214)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Street Lighting - contract synergies (B/R.6.214)		
Saving	£98,000	Business Planning Reference	B/R.6.214
Business Planning Brief Description	Annual saving from joint contract drafting with partners. This will not lead to any reduction in street lighting provision.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Christine May, Interim Service Director: Infrastructure Management & Operations		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

It was agreed between Cambridgeshire County Council, Northamptonshire County Council, Balfour Beatty Living Places and Connect Roads that in the event that both Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire entered into the Street Lighting PFI Contracts that they would benefit from project efficiencies and synergies. A £8m joint saving was offered, which could begin to be realised once both parties completed their Core Investment Programmes (CIP). From the completion of CIP onwards the savings can be taken monthly over the last twenty years of the PFI Contracts.

The Synergies money is made up of two parts:

- CIP Project savings - £2,407,698 (total over the lifetime of the Contract, not indexed)

- Operational savings - £1,667,961 (total over the lifetime of the Contract, not indexed)

CIP Project savings are created by a cheaper works price for the CIP than was set in the original Financial Model and Loan Facility Agreement, and therefore Connect Roads has drawn down less money than modelled and have not used the full Base Loan Facility.

However, the Base Loan Facility is fully swapped with a Hedge Fund and to realise the CIP Project savings the Authority is required to pay the partial hedge break costs for the savings amount and any other associated costs (other liabilities).

The Authority had two options with regards to the break costs:

- to pay the cost upfront, or; (Chosen)

- to pay over time by a reduction in the monthly saving

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Approach

Aims / Objectives

Project Overview - What are we doing

What assumptions have you made?

It is considered that the net benefit to the Authority would be greater if the Authority pre-paid the break costs.

What constraints does the project face?

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

The Authority had two options with regards to the break costs:

; to pay the cost upfront, or;

l; to pay over time by a reduction in the monthly saving. It is considered that the net benefit to the Authority would be greater if the Authority pre-paid the break costs, i.e. it is anticipated that pre-paying the break costs would give a higher Net Present Value to the Authority than a reduction from the monthly savings.

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

N/A

What is outside of scope?

N/A

Project Dependencies

Title

The Street Lighting Synergies will contribute to the Corporate Services savings.

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None identified

Risks

None identified

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

No impact on the general population or any specific groups

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

ETE BP- Street Lighting - conversion to LED (B/R.6.216)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP- Street Lighting - conversion to LED (B/R.6.216)		
Saving	£95,000	Business Planning Reference	B/R.6.216
Business Planning Brief Description	Saving on energy costs by introducing more energy efficient LED lights where there is a business case to do so.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Christine May, Interim Service Director: Infrastructure Management & Operations		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Energy savings on street lighting.

Accrued Lighting

CCC have identified at least 2675 'accrued lights' that could benefit from being upgraded to LEDs. These are lights from potentially older developments (with older, less efficient lighting solutions) that CCC have taken on responsibility for since the start of the PFI contract. As a result, these lights were not upgraded to the more efficient PFI lanterns during the Core Investment Programme.

Whilst we are currently waiting on updated figures from Balfour Beatty, early indicative costs are below:

Total replacement costs: £735,000

Potential Annual Energy Savings: £95,000 p.a

Payback period for investment: 7.4 years

The current payback period suggests this could be sensible for CCC to look into as part of an Invest-to-Save programme. We have requested Balfour Beatty to provide more accurate, updated figures that we can then put forward as part of a project proposal. However, CCC may not be able to get the same terms and conditions on these LED lanterns as we receive on the current PFI lanterns. As a result, CCC may need to account for some additional risk that it may need to take on towards the end of the PFI contract or pay for increased insurance/guarantees. This may make the payback period less favourable than it initially appears.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

We would miss the opportunity to capture savings.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

To gain energy savings from LED implementation

Project Overview - What are we doing

The project is to upgrade c.2,700 older style lanterns to LEDs. These street lights were not upgraded as part of the Core Investment Programme as they did not form part of the original inventory. These lights have been accrued into the PFI since contract commencement, mostly from road adoptions.

What assumptions have you made?

LED lights are more energy efficient

What constraints does the project face?

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

N/A

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

Approximately 2,700 older style lanterns have been identified to be upgraded to LED lanterns.

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

N/A

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

N/A

Risks

Title

Agreeing the terms of the change in the PFI contract

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

No significant impact on the general population or any specific groups.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

ETE BP - Redistribution of parking income (B/R.6.217)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Redistribution of parking income (B/R.6.217)		
Saving	£500,000	Business Planning Reference	B/R.6.217
Business Planning Brief Description	Use a greater proportion of on-street parking income to fund highways and transport works as allowed by current legislation.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Christine May, Interim Service Director: Infrastructure Management and Operations		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Keeping the highway clear of snow and ice is a statutory duty for us, one which if not fulfilled, impacts on people's ability to access jobs and services they need. The costs of the service are significant and with overall revenue pressures, if alternative ways of funding some of the winter maintenance budget are not found, there may be pressures to reduce the service. This is therefore a means of protecting the overall service provision.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

It would impact on the council's wider financial plan if winter operations continued to be fully funded by revenue or alternatively gritting routes would have to be cut and the County Council would be at risk of failing its statutory duty, as well as creating an environment that was detrimental to road safety.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

To utilise surplus of the on-street account to enable the County Council to carry out a statutory function (winter maintenance/operations).

Project Overview - What are we doing

Utilising surplus from the on-street parking account to cover the cost of undertaking winter gritting (of footways and carriageways) across Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire. In turn this will free up significant revenue funding, helping to relieve pressure on the County Council's revenue position and assist the realisation of a balanced budget.

What assumptions have you made?

That the on-street account will continue to generate sufficient surplus in order to cover the cost of a proportion of the winter maintenance budget.

What constraints does the project face?

The ability to cover a proportion of the winter maintenance budget is constrained by the amount of surplus generated by the on-street account and the national legislation associated with use of the on-street account.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

Winter operations for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire

What is outside of scope?

Winter operations in Huntingdonshire, Fenland & East Cambridgeshire

Project Dependencies

None identified

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None identified

Risks

None identified

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

No-one is affected by this proposal if it goes ahead, residents, visitors and businesses are affected if gritting routes are reduced, as indeed with the County Council for not meeting its statutory duty.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Enables the Highway Authority to maintain current gritting levels and meet statutory duty.

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

On-street account surplus is not available for use on other transport & highway related items.

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

ETE BP - Contract Savings on Signals (B/R.6.218)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Contract Savings on Signals (B/R.6.218)		
Saving	£100,000	Business Planning Reference	B/R.6.218
Business Planning Brief Description	Savings from a new contract for signals on the highway, which came into force in 2017, from retendering and energy efficiency.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Christine May, Interim Service Director: Infrastructure Management and Operations		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council had previously appointed a single contractor to maintain their Intelligent Transport Systems. Their contract was up for renewal following the 10 year agreement it went out to tender and as a result a new contract was agreed as of September 2016. The new contract established an efficient and effective route to deliver the maintenance of ITS and the delivery of new equipment, supporting existing investment programmes.

Section 41 of The Highways Act 1980 imposes a duty on the Highway Authority to maintain highways at public expense. Failure to maintain our traffic signal asset will be in breach of the act and put at great risk the safety of travelling public, including cyclists and pedestrians.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

As the contract was coming to an end it was imperative that Cambridgeshire County Council found a new contractor that would ensure the maintenance of signals was maintained.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

To appoint a contractor that would enhance efficiencies whilst reducing procurement costs in appointing individual contractors for specialist work.

Project Overview - What are we doing

Cambridgeshire County Council acted as the lead authority on behalf of the other 5 authorities and LGSS Law and LGSS Procurement have supported this through the drafting of the contract and managing the procurement process. A considerable amount of support has been received from the partner authorities in the production of the specification, contract documents and evaluation of the submissions from bidders.

For each authority to deliver the service they enter into their own 'call-off' contract under the framework with the single supplier. Cambridgeshire's call-off period started 04/09/2016.

What assumptions have you made?

What constraints does the project face?

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

N/A

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

None Identified

What is outside of scope?

None identified

Project Dependencies

None identified

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None identified

Risks

None Identified

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

N/A

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

ETE BP - Improved Bus Lane enforcement (B/R 7.119)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Improved Bus Lane enforcement (B/R 7.119)		
Saving	£400,000	Business Planning Reference	B/R.7.119
Business Planning Brief Description	We are installing more cameras to do more bus lane enforcement to keep traffic moving on our roads. Where people are caught driving in bus lanes we will enforce penalties.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Christine May, Interim Service Director: Infrastructure Management and Operations		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

There are some areas with rising bollards which is out-dated technology and expensive to maintain therefore where possible this is being replaced with bus gate enforcement using automatic number plate recognition to enforce the restriction.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

The ongoing costs would remain and traffic would continue to move down restricted roads and be unable to enforce.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

- Effective enforcement of restrictions on traffic movement

Project Overview - What are we doing

- Will need to advertise and consult on changes
- Change signage and streets
- Installing cameras
- Updating back office systems to ensure enforcement can take place
- Need to ensure there is back office capacity

What assumptions have you made?

- Drivers will continue to drive into restricted areas
- That the fines will be more than the cost to install

What constraints does the project face?

- Capacity of the back office to ensure enforcement can take place
- The proposed sites are more complicated than sites that have already been changed
- There is a strong dependency on #PR00196 ETE BP - Increase on street parking fees (B/R 7.118) and #PR00206 ETE BP - Removing Park & Ride charges through partnership contributions (B/R.6.104) which, between them, have an income target of £600K, i.e. the cost that CCC would need to fund in order to be able to remove P&R charges

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

N/A

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

None identified

What is outside of scope?

None identified

Project Dependencies

None identified

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits**Non Financial Benefits Summary**

None identified

Risks

None identified

Project Impact**Community Impact Assessment****Who will be affected by this proposal?**

- Drivers around Cambridge

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

- If effective, it will improve bus movement and prevent cars going into restricted areas

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?**Are there other impacts which are more neutral?****Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics****Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed**

Business Case

ETE BP - Increase on street parking fees (B/R.7.118)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Increase on street parking fees (B/R.7.118)		
Saving	£200,000	Business Planning Reference	(B/R.7.118)
Business Planning Brief Description	It is proposed to increase on-street parking fees to encourage visitors to Cambridge to use alternatives such as Park and Ride - the projected income will also therefore increase		
Senior Responsible Officer	Graham Hughes, Executive Director Economy Transport and Environment		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

It is in line with the overall objective of Greater Cambridge Partnership to tackle peak time congestion in Cambridge, on-street parking fees are being reviewed to promote modal shift to more sustainable methods of travel.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

There would be little shift in the methods of transport that communities use and as a result continued challenges with peak time congestion.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

- To support the aims of Greater Cambridge Partnership in tackling congestion through Cambridge, through effective management of on-street parking.

Project Overview - What are we doing

- Will need to complete a legal order to increase the fees
- Will need to change the tariffs and signage on all machines
- The public will need to be informed of the changes

What assumptions have you made?

- The projected savings that will be made

What constraints does the project face?

- There are impending changes in central Government regarding implementing new parking charges that would require full public consultation. Currently, for minor tariff changes this isn't required therefore if central changes are made - this could delay the implementation.
- There is an upfront cost associated with the tariff changes, however it is anticipated this will be covered by the increased income.
- There is a strong dependency on #PR00198 ETE BP - Improved Bus Lane enforcement (B/R 7.119) and #PR00206 ETE BP - Removing Park & Ride charges through partnership contributions (B/R.6.104) which, between them, have an income target of £600K, i.e. the cost that CCC would need to fund in order to be able to remove P&R charges

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

N/A

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

None identified

What is outside of scope?

None identified

Project Dependencies

None identified

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None identified

Risks

None identified

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

- People travelling in/around Cambridge
- Businesses if customers are using spaces

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

- Promotes a more sustainable method of travel and a reduction in congestion

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

- Implication of cost increase for users

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

ETE BP - Relocation of Huntingdon Registration Office (B/R.6.220)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Relocation of Huntingdon Registration Office (B/R.6.220)		
Saving	£20,000	Business Planning Reference	B/R.6.220
Business Planning Brief Description	By moving Huntingdon registration office into the library we can make efficiencies and savings by sharing staff and space.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Christine May, Interim Service Director: Infrastructure Management and Operations		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

The reasons for undertaking this project are as follows:

- To make better use of Cambridgeshire County Council's building assets.
- To increase the number of people who go into the library.
- To increase access to wider CCC services.
- To increase opportunities for partnership working between the registration service and the library service.
- To allow the coroner service to make better use of the space in Lawrence Court.
- To facilitate interim arrangements for the coroner service in Lawrence court to allow remedial building works to take place

To make better use of Cambridgeshire County Council's building assets

Phase One

- To increase the available space in Lawrence Court for the coroner service
- To make space in Lawrence Court for the medical examiner service to move into
- To adapt the layout of the library to make space for the majority of the registration service
- To move the majority of the registration service into the library

(The registration service ceremony room and some storage will remain in Lawrence Court)

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

If we do not deliver this project we will miss an opportunity to make better use of building assets. We will also need to invest in more accommodation for the incoming Medical Examiner service.

Also this will prohibit the increased partnership working between the registration service and the library service in Huntingdon. This will also be a missed opportunity to increase use of Huntingdon library and associated benefits.

We will not be able to maximise the use of building space which will have a particularly negative impact on the coroner service. If the registration service remains in Lawrence Court then the coroner service will not be able to go ahead with plans to adapt the ceremony room and use more of the meeting rooms which would allow them to host jury inquests in the building. As a result they may have to continue paying to hire rooms for jury inquests, and will not have space for the future Medical Examiner service.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

The key objectives of this project are as follows:

- To move the majority of the registration service into the library (The registration service ceremony room and some storage will remain in Lawrence Court)
- To increase the available space in Lawrence Court for the coroner service and longer term to host the medical examiner service

Project Overview - What are we doing

Maximising the use of space.

What assumptions have you made?

Assumption that we need customer facing rooms for the registration service.

What constraints does the project face?

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Option L1

Move the registration service into the library.

Registration service to have two new rooms plus the use of an existing room.

Library to have **one new room** to replace the one that they give to the registration service.

Option L2

Move the Registration service into the library.

Registration service to have two new rooms plus the use of an existing room.

Library to have **two new rooms**: one to replace the one that they give to the registration service plus a second room that can be rented out.

Option L3

Leave the registration service in Lawrence Court and do not provide any extra space for the coroner service and do not accommodate the medical examiner service

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

- Alterations to the library building.
- Moving the registration service into the library.

What is outside of scope?

- Repair work on Lawrence Court.
- Alterations to the ceremony room in Lawrence Court.
- Moving the medical examiners service into Lawrence Court

Project Dependencies

Title

Repair work to Lawrence Court

Library Transformation programme

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None identified

Risks

Title

Funding

Disruption to library service caused by building works

Disruption to services caused by move

The new location arrangements may have a negative impact on registration service customers

Members of the public may not know where to go to access services

The new location arrangements may have a negative impact on library service customers

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

This project will affect members of the public who use the registration service or library service in Huntingdon. No specific group will be impacted any more than the general population.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

ETE BP - Reinvestment in Library book fund (B/R.6.209)

Project Overview

Project Title	ETE BP - Reinvestment in Library book fund (B/R.6.209)		
Reinvestment	£230,000	Business Planning Reference	(B/R.6.209)
Business Planning Brief Description	Reinvestment in the book fund following reductions made in 2017-18		
Senior Responsible Officer	Christine May Interim Service Director:Infrastructure Management and Operations		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

This proposal is to re-instate the stock fund, which was reduced for 2016/17 as a short-term measure with the intention to re-instate in 2017/18. This links to proposal B/R 6.208 which will find alternative ways of delivering this saving.

Cambridgeshire's Library Service is delivered through 32 libraries, 10 community-managed libraries, 3 mobile libraries and a range of digital and online channels, including a self-service catalogue, eBooks, eAudio, eMagazines/Newspapers, and online reference resources.

Cambridge Central Library welcomes 700,000 visitors per annum, and with over half a million issues is the fourth busiest library in England. 60% of the county population have a library card and the service issues 2.6m items, receives 2.3m visits, and supports 250 reading groups per annum.

The stock fund provides the resources available in all libraries including books, newspapers, magazines, audio books, CDs, DVDs and online licences for eBooks and online reference resources. The fund also provides specialist material such as large print, foreign languages, braille, dyslexia-friendly resources, and wide range of health and other information for independent living and targeted audiences. The stock fund also supports intelligent systems that help manage the stock and enable staff efficiencies, including purchasing automated catalogue records and producing activity reports to facilitate effective spending.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

The stock (book) fund enables the library service to invest in books and other items which are valued and wanted by our service users. Failure to reinstate this funding would limit Cambridgeshire's libraries in their ability to provide the statutory service. In particular, reductions in the stock fund have resulted in a significant decline in the number of new titles that the Library Service is able to provide, and it tends to be the new titles which library users reserve.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

The aim of this project is to reinstate funding which was reduced for a one-year period in 2017/18, enabling the Library Service to provide resources which are valued and used by visitors to Cambridgeshire's libraries, as a core element of our statutory service provision.

Project Overview - What are we doing

What assumptions have you made?

What constraints does the project face?

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

This proposal is part of the wider Libraries Transformation Programme.

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

The County Council has a statutory duty to deliver an efficient and comprehensive library and information service.

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

Title

Library Service Transformation

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None identified

Risks

Title

Failure of Libraries Transformation Programme to generate income/savings to enable this

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

N/A

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

