



INFRASTRUCTURE, GOVERNMENT AND HEALTHCARE

# **Bury Metropolitan Borough Council**

**Review of Service Prioritisation**

**May 2008**

AUDIT

# Contents

---

1	Executive Summary	
1.1	Introduction	3
1.2	Key findings	3
1.3	Key learning points	4
1.4	Way forward	4
2	Introduction	
2.1	Background	5
2.2	Objectives and scope of our review	5
2.3	Audit approach	6
2.4	Acknowledgements	6
3	Service Prioritisation	
3.1	Introduction	7
3.2	Annual Revenue budget and establishment of the PIR	7
3.3	Utilisation of the PIR	8
4	Capital	
4.1	Introduction	11
4.2	Capital bids	11
5	Redirection of Resource to Priorities	
5.1	Introduction	13
5.2	Background	13
5.3	Identification of cashable efficiency savings	13
5.4	Assessment of cashable efficiency savings options	14
6	Alignment of Resource	
6.1	Introduction	16
6.2	Background	16
6.3	Realignment of resources	16
6.4	Identification of efficiency savings at Service level	17
6.5	Financial monitoring of PIR allocations	18
6.6	Monitoring the outcomes of PIR allocations	19

## Contents (Cont.)

---

Appendix 1

20

This report is addressed to the Authority and has been prepared for the sole use of the Authority. We take no responsibility to any officer or Member acting in their individual capacities, or to third parties. The Audit Commission has issued a document entitled *Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies*. This summarises where the responsibilities of auditors begin and end and what is expected from the audited body. We draw your attention to this document. External auditors do not act as a substitute for the audited body's own responsibility for putting in place proper arrangements to ensure that public business is conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for, and used economically, efficiently and effectively. If you have any concerns or are dissatisfied with any part of KPMG's work, in the first instance you should contact Adrian Lythgo, who is the engagement director to the Authority, telephone 0113 231 3054, email [adrian.lythgo@kpmg.co.uk](mailto:adrian.lythgo@kpmg.co.uk) who will try to resolve your complaint. If you are dissatisfied with your response please contact Trevor Rees on 0161 246 4000, email [trevor.rees@kpmg.co.uk](mailto:trevor.rees@kpmg.co.uk), who is the national contact partner for all of KPMG's work with the Audit Commission. After this, if you still dissatisfied with how your complaint has been handled you can access the Audit Commission's complaints procedure. Put your complaint in writing to the Complaints Team, Nicholson House, Lime Kiln Close, Stoke Gifford, Bristol, BS34 8SU or by e mail to: [complaints@audit-commission.gov.uk](mailto:complaints@audit-commission.gov.uk). Their telephone number is 0117 975 3131, textphone (minicom) 020 7630 0421.



# 1 Executive summary

---

## 1.1 Introduction

The Council's 2004 CPA report identified that non-priorities are not formally stated, increasing the risk of resources being redirected to low priority areas to the detriment of high priority areas. There is a risk that the failure to redirect resources from lower priority services to higher priority services could lead to service and corporate targets/objectives not being achieved.

Since then, the Council has undertaken work to strengthen its priority-led funding arrangements, and has developed a Priority Investment Reserve to support high priority areas. The priority investment reserve has been funded largely by cashable efficiency savings and has seen the movement of resource from lower priority to higher priority areas of activity.

The Council has now completed its 2008/09 budget setting process; however this review focuses on the processes in place for 2007/08. This has enabled us to consider how investments have been monitored and assessed over the course of the 2007/08 financial year, and this review will also inform our 2007/08 Use of Resources assessment.

## 1.2 Key findings

The key findings of the review are:

- There are clear linkages between the financial strategy, the corporate priorities, and the Priority Investment Reserve (PIR);
- A clear approval process is in place to direct PIR resources to services and schemes;
- Services are proactive in identifying cashable efficiency savings to contribute to the PIR; and
- Service reviews have been successful in identifying cashable efficiency savings that, over the medium term, will contribute to the PIR.

# 1 Executive summary *(Cont.)*

---

## 1.3 Key learning points

The key learning points are:

- Outcomes and performance targets set out in PIR bid business cases should be SMART and incorporate specific targets that can be measured and milestones to facilitate monitoring;
- PIR resource allocated to services should be monitored and reported explicitly at Service Star Chamber level. This will enable officers to identify levels of PIR invested in services and facilitate analysis of outcomes versus spend; and
- Formal service monitoring of the utilisation of the PIR should be undertaken throughout the financial year. This should assess each PIR scheme on both a financial and outcomes basis against milestones set out in business cases. This should be undertaken both in the year in question and in subsequent years for recurrent funding until the milestones and outcomes are achieved.

## 1.4 Way forward

We will discuss the findings of the review with officers to agree an action plan to address the key issues going forward. In addition, we shall continue to work with officers to constructively challenge the delivery of action plans.

## 2 Introduction

---

### 2.1 Background

The Council's 2004 CPA report identified that non-priorities are not formally stated, increasing the risk of resources being redirected to low priority areas to the detriment of high priority areas. There is a risk that the failure to redirect resources from lower priority services to higher priority services could lead to service and corporate targets/objectives not being achieved.

Since then, the Council has undertaken work to strengthen its priority-led funding arrangements, and has developed a Priority Investment Reserve to support high priority areas.

### 2.2 Objectives and scope of our review

The objectives of the review were to assess the operation of Priority Investment Reserve in redirecting resources from low priority services to high priority services. We also reviewed how resources have been realigned within services. Specifically, this review has focused on:

- how the Priority Investment Reserve operates, in particular how it distinguishes between high and low priority services and how this fits in with the Council's corporate objectives (Section 3);
- how capital allocations operate and ensure linkages to the achievement of the priorities set out in the Corporate Plan (Section 4);
- how successful the Priority Investment Reserve has been in redirecting resources from lower priority services to higher priority services (Section 5);
- the extent to which resources have been realigned within services (Section 6);
- the degree to which services receiving additional investment have identified the expected outcomes in terms of targets, arrangements that are in place to ensure that this is adequately monitored both during and after investment in the priority area, and that redirection has been successful (Section 6); and
- the degree to which outcomes have actually been delivered in practice (Section 6).

Our review focused on both the corporate approach to the Priority Investment Reserve and also how this was managed by services. Adult Care Services and Children's Services were selected for this review.

## 2 Introduction (Cont.)

---

### 2.3 Audit approach

Our approach has been to:

- Reviews of key documents such as:
  - priority investment reserve model;
  - documentation for bids from the Priority Investment Reserve; and
  - detailed budget information from services to identify movements within services.
- Interviews and discussion with key staff responsible for developing and utilising the Priority Investment Reserve; and
- Interviews and discussion with key staff involved in setting budgets at a service level.

### 2.4 Acknowledgements

We would like to take this opportunity to thank all those staff at the Council who have supported this review.

## 3 Service Prioritisation

---

### 3.1 Introduction

This section covers:

- an overview of how the Priority Investment Reserve (PIR) operates; and
- how the PIR fits in with the Council's corporate objectives.

### 3.2 Annual Revenue budget and establishment of the PIR

A strategy is in place for the development of the Council's annual budget. This includes identifying cashable efficiency savings in line with the 2007/08 Gershon targets and paying an equivalent sum into the PIR. The strategy also makes clear the need to link investment and savings decisions to the Council's policies, priorities and other strategies and the need to maintain the direction of travel on service performance. For 2007/08, cashable savings of £1.9m were identified for transferring into the PIR. In addition to this resource, £0.521m was also made available to the PIR as the result of surplus savings, resulting in a total PIR for 2007/08 of £2.421m.

The Council's stated policy is to redirect cashable Gershon savings into services in line with an assessment of needs which are primarily driven by the Council's stated priorities as set out in the Bury Plan. In the 2007/08 budget this was achieved by passing a sum equivalent to the cashable savings into the PIR and then allocating the balance in the Reserve against bids submitted by Portfolio holders.



### 3 Service Prioritisation (Cont.)

The Council has identified a number of specific revenue pressures and priorities that will take precedence for funding from the PIR during the life of the Financial Strategy:

<b>Corporate Priority</b>	<b>Activity to be Funded</b>
Cleaner, safer, greener	- Waste reduction / recycling (priority)
Promoting Healthier Living/Better Opportunities for Children and Young People	- High cost care packages (pressure)
Better Opportunities for Children and Young People	- Implications from the Green Paper on Children and Young People in Care (possible pressure/priority)
Improved Cultural and Sporting Opportunities	- Positive activities for older people (priority)
Putting customers first	- Customer relationship management (priority)
All	- Backlog maintenance (priority) - Equal pay / national job evaluation scheme (pressure)

#### 3.3 Utilisation of the PIR

A number of efficiency savings were rejected by Council at the final stage of the budget setting process. The first call, therefore, on the 2007/08 PIR was to fund the resulting budget shortfalls as follows:

- EDS waste collection saving not recommended - £0.300m
- EDS - closure of Ramsbottom Civic Hall not recommended - £0.020m
- Adult Care Services savings not recommended - £0.390m.

This left a balance of £1.711m in the PIR available for investment bids.

### 3 Service Prioritisation (*Cont.*)

---

Portfolio holders are required to submit growth bid business cases for funding from the PIR resource. Bids are made using a comprehensive pro forma which requires the following information:

- Whether the bid is for recurrent or non-recurrent resource;
- An option appraisal to demonstrate that resource is not available elsewhere;
- Contribution to the delivery of Council priorities;
- Risks to services and objectives if funding is not received;
- Expected outcomes of funding, and impact on performance (linked to PIs) and efficiencies; and
- Confirmation that bids have first been considered by Members (for example, via Start Chamber)

This pro forma provides assurance that bids are valid and that they have been appropriately planned and will support Council priorities. PIR bids are subject to initial review by senior council officers, including the leader, Chief Executive and Director of Finance and E-Government, and are then reviewed in detail by each services' Star Chamber. The final submission of PIR bids is presented to Council as part of the budget approval process.

A number of approved PIR bids for Adult Care Services and Children's Services have been reviewed to confirm that all information required has been provided in bids. This has identified that the business case pro forma does not require outcomes and performance improvements to be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-specific). This makes an assessment of individual bids more difficult, and increases the risk of desired outcomes and improvements in performance not being monitored adequately or achieved.

#### **Recommendation 1**

Outcomes and performance targets set out in PIR bid business cases should be SMART and incorporate specific targets that can be measured and milestones to facilitate monitoring. These milestones should then be used at Star Chamber to assess the extent to which investment has been successful in achieving priorities. PIR funding of schemes that demonstrate a failure to achieve outcome and contribute to priorities should be reassessed and associated resource should be considered for redirection to further schemes that better support the Bury Plan's priorities.

### 3 Service Prioritisation (Cont.)

---

A final bidding list is assessed, following which recommendations are made to the ruling group. Upon approval as part of the final budget approval process, PIR budgets are allocated to services. As part of the adoption of the 2007/08 budget, the following schemes were approved:

- £0.580m – Foster care payments
- £0.380m – Age of opportunities
- £0.230m – Commissioning Team
- £0.170m - Recycling
- £0.150 – Council Tax reduction for over 65s
- £0.073m – Climate change bid
- £0.037m – Book Fund
- £0.032m – 0.1% reduction in Council Tax rise
- £0.003m – International Relations

Although a clear bidding system is in place for PIR resource, services have noted that it is unclear how the decision-making process is undertaken to determine the corporate allocation of the PIR. No feedback is received by services in respect of bids that are not approved and therefore services can be unclear as to why this is the case.

#### **Recommendation 2**

Each unsuccessful PIR bid should receive formal feedback to provide services with details of the reasons for its failure. This will provide services with a clear picture of the why individual bids have failed so that they can ensure that future bids are appropriate.

The implementation of PIR schemes and consideration of the assessment of their impact and outcomes is detailed in Section 6 to this report.

## 4 Capital

---

### 4.1 Introduction

This section considers how capital allocations operate and ensure linkages to the achievement of priorities set out in the Corporate Plan.

### 4.2 Background

The Capital Programme is funded from four main sources:

- Borrowing
- Capital grants
- Capital receipts from the sale of assets
- Revenue contributions and reserves

The total available capital resource for 2007/08 was £42.169m.

### 4.2 Capital bids

Preparation of the Capital Programme is undertaken in two stages. Firstly, schemes and bids are placed into the following categories:

- 100% funded schemes. These are schemes that are fully funded, where funding is ring-fenced by the Government or another external agency.
- Contractually/morally approved schemes. These are schemes that are committed, generally from starts made in the previous financial year.
- On-going programmes. This includes Statutory/emergency schemes, and relates primarily to programmes of expenditure which bring spending on various services up to the level indicated by the service Annual Capital Guidelines.
- Discretionary schemes.

## 4 Capital (Cont.)

---

The 2007/08 budget setting process set out an assumption that Members would wish to include 100% funded, morally and contractually committed, on-going and statutory and emergency schemes in the capital programme. This accounted for £41.647m of the total capital resource of £42.169m, leaving a balance of just £0.522m available for discretionary schemes. Although this balance is low, it is an issue that the Council has been aware during its financial planning and is as a result of the high level of longer-term capital schemes. The Council has therefore chosen to focus all available discretionary scheme funding on a small number of priority areas.

Discretionary capital resource for 2007/08 was allocated to one scheme bid and to two corporate requirements (backlog maintenance and capitalisation of maintenance). The capital requirement of these schemes totalled £1.350m, exceeding the available resource by £0.828m. This was addressed at budget setting by the approval of capital slippage of £0.600m and additional prudential borrowing of £0.228m.

There is an increased risk to the Council in taking on additional prudential borrowing, and the Council may breach its Golden Rules if this option is used on a recurrent basis. The Council needs to undertake a full review of its capital programme to confirm that spend is directed to priority areas. This should include a full assessment of all morally approved schemes and all ongoing schemes.

### **Recommendation 3**

The Council should undertake a full review of its Capital Programme, including all morally committed and ongoing schemes, to determine whether each scheme is consistent with, and supports the achievement of, the Bury Plan priorities. This should include an assessment of the outcomes to date of capital investments. Consideration should be given to redirecting funding from schemes that do not wholly contribute to priorities to other scheme bids.

Consideration should also be given to whether it would be appropriate to require all morally committed and ongoing schemes to re-bid for resource alongside new bids. This will ensure that the Council's capital programme going forwards maximises delivery against priorities.

## 5 Redirection of Resource to Priorities

---

### 5.1 Introduction

This section considers how successful the PIR has been in redirecting resources from lower priority services to higher priority services.

### 5.2 Background

The PIR is funded by two elements:

- Cashable efficiency savings
- Savings exceeding targeted levels

The Financial Strategy recognises that having a priority-led approach to the budget implies the need to disinvest in non-priority areas.

### 5.3 Identification of cashable efficiency savings

Policy direction in terms of identifying efficiency savings has centered on:

- Efficiency savings
- Prioritising those policy and service areas central to Bury's Community Strategy and Corporate Plan
- Negating the impact of reduced expenditure upon service recipients
- Maximising savings in 'back office' functions
- Maximising 'value for money' across service areas
- Reducing expenditure in areas of top quartile service delivery
- Maximising efficiency
- Outsourcing service provision where justified
- Providing an 'economy of scale' by cross agency delivery in Bury
- Exploring cross-boundary service delivery models
- Ceasing some areas of discretionary activity

## 5 Redirection of Resource to Priorities *(Cont.)*

---

### 5.4 Assessment of cashable efficiency savings options

Each savings option is supported by a pro forma to ensure that services assess options in a uniform manner.

Cashable efficiency savings targets are recurrent and are allocated to services on a budget pro rata basis, and services are required to identify cashable savings from within existing budgets to meet these targets.

The allocation of cashable savings targets does not give consideration to pressures that individual services face or the ability of services to identify savings. Some services are more demand led than others, and therefore there is a risk that savings are not achievable in a budget pro rata manner across all services. There is therefore a risk that the allocation of savings targets is not on a comparable basis in terms of likelihood of achievement without impacting on service delivery and the achievement of corporate priorities. Savings that are not achievable without impacting on services or priorities have an increased risk of being rejected by Members, and subsequently may be funded by the PIR. This results in a reduced PIR available for investment in priorities.

Identified savings are ranked by services in terms of palatability as follows:

- A – Achievable but with an impact on services
- B – Some implications and / or political concerns
- C – Unpalatable options

A list of acceptable options is then required from Services and considered by Council as part of the budget process. The 2007/08 PIR of £2.421m was reduced by £0.710m (29%) as a result of savings proposals that were not accepted by Council as follows:

- EDS waste collection saving not recommended - £0.300m
- EDS - closure of Ramsbottom Civic Hall not recommended - £0.020m
- Adult Care Services savings not recommended - £0.390m

## 5 Redirection of Resource to Priorities *(Cont.)*

---

### **Recommendation 4**

Cashable efficiency savings targets should be allocated to services following an assessment of where savings are most achievable rather than on a budget pro rata basis. This will ensure that efficiency targets are realistically set and reduce the risk that the PIR is used to fund unpalatable savings instead of investing in priorities.



## 6 Alignment of Resource

---

### 6.1 Introduction

This section considers the extent to which resources have been realigned within services, and the degree to which services receiving additional investment have identified the expected outcomes in terms of targets, and that arrangements are in place to ensure that this is adequately monitored both during and after investment in the priority areas. It also considers the extent to which outcomes have actually been achieved.

### 6.2 Background

As noted in Section 2.2, this review has focused on two services (Children's Services and Adult Care Services) to determine how they manage the realignment of resource within services and to assess the extent to which targets have been established and reported.

### 6.3 Realignment of resources

The Council allocates resource as part of the annual budget process by calculating a standstill budget which takes account of inflationary adjustments. Uplifts do not take account of changes in demand. Cashable savings targets are then applied to these budgets as discussed in Section 5.3. The PIR can be utilised to fund any shortfalls at service level between requirement and resource uplifted from the previous financial year. There is a need to ensure that the PIR is not used simply to correct budget shortfalls, but is instead used to invest in priority areas. It is important that the Council considers whether budgets are set correctly in the first place to enable a status quo. If not, additional savings may be required to enable a balanced budget to be set prior to the utilisation of the PIR.

The demand led nature of many services means that there is limited opportunity for reprioritisation. There has been no formal redirection of resource within Children's Services. Budgets have been rolled forwards annually and remain as such. Services overall are required to achieve a bottom line position only, and therefore surpluses and deficits have been netted off. There is therefore an increased risk that budgets are not appropriate and as a result resource is not directed appropriately between activities to drive priorities.

## 6 Alignment of Resource (Cont.)

### Recommendation 5

Services should undertake a bottom up review of the adequacy and appropriateness of budgets to ensure that resource is appropriately directed to activities and that activities support the achievement of priorities. This will facilitate any required realignment of resource within service budgets to ensure that resource is directed from non-priority to priority areas and that individual revenue budgets remain meaningful.

Children's Services has made significant progress in reassessing its budget and reviewing the use of its resources. As part of this process, approximately £1.600m of savings have been achieved, and a further £3.100m of investment resource has been received from the centre. This demonstrates how finances have been realigned to ensure that the allocation of resources is in alignment to priorities, many of which are demand-led.

Adult Care Services has faced a challenging budget. In addition to its element of the corporate cashable savings target to support the PIR for 2008/09, it has also identified the requirement for additional savings of £2.400m to balance the 2008/09 budget. Work to identify these savings was ongoing at the time of our review,

### 6.4 Identification of efficiency savings at Service level

Efficiency savings at service level have not been pro rata across budgets. Instead specific savings plans have been identified. These have then been reviewed at service and corporate level before being adopted (also see Section 5.3).

Adult Services have undertaken a number of service reviews that have considered which services are being provided and how they can be improved and made more efficient. A service review of Home Care has identified recurrent savings of £0.500m, and other reviews have been undertaken or are ongoing in respect of Disabled Services and Older Persons Homes. The aim of each of these reviews is to continue to achieve outputs but to also generate savings. Each service is subject to a corporate service review every three years, and reviews have had the specific objective of identifying cost effectiveness measures. Although there is confidence that efficiency savings can be generated as a direct result of service reviews, there is a concern that these savings may only be realised in the medium rather than the short term. If this is the case, there is an increased risk that services will struggle to continue to identify efficiency savings on an annual basis in the short term. This therefore emphasises the need for assurance that budgets are appropriately set.

## 6 Alignment of Resource (Cont.)

The political acceptance of efficiency savings is not finalised until early in the calendar year and it may therefore not always be possible for savings plans to be immediately implemented at the start of the next financial year. As a result, the full year effect of savings may not be fully achieved in the first year. Services are proactive in recognising the possibility of savings not being accepted by the Council and undertake financial planning with two draft budgets in place. This ensures that services are prepared for whatever the outcome of the budget process are, and reduces any delay in implementing budgets and associated plans.

There is a risk of slippage against expenditure plans in the first year of investment in priorities, and it is currently unclear what should happen to PIR resource that is not fully utilised. At present this is retained by services and therefore can be used to support the overall budget position. However, the aim of the PIR is to support investment in Council priorities, any unutilised PIR resource should be retained corporately and invested in priority bids on a non-recurrent basis.

### Recommendation 6

Successful bids should be subject to separate budget monitoring to demonstrate how resource has been utilised, and to identify the level of resource still available. Consideration should be given to schemes that forecast that they will not utilise resource fully in year to determine what action, if any, is required. Underspends against the PIR should not be allocated against further service budgets or used to prop up the overall budget position of a service. A Corporate reserve list of schemes should be maintained for in-year funding if such resource becomes available.

### 6.5 Financial monitoring of PIR allocations

Financial monitoring of schemes funded by the PIR form part of the overall budget monitoring for Services at each Star Chamber. If a single entity scheme is set up, this would be monitored on a separate budget line and would therefore be readily identifiable. However, investment that is in addition to existing resource as part of rolled-forwards budgets would be amalgamated and would not be readily identifiable.

### Recommendation 7

PIR resource allocated to services should be monitored and reported explicitly at Service Star Chamber level. This will enable officers to identify levels of PIR invested in services and facilitate analysis of outcomes versus spend.

## 6 Alignment of Resource *(Cont.)*

---

### 6.6 Monitoring the outcomes of PIR allocations

As discussed in Section 3.3, bids for PIR resource set out outcomes and impacts on performance such as PIs. Although these performance outcomes form part of the assessment as to whether or not schemes are successful in receiving PIR allocations, services are not required to demonstrate achievement as a result of receiving and utilising this resource. It is noted that many activities are demand-led and it may therefore at times be difficult to demonstrate outcomes, but in order for the Council to assess how successful the PIR has been in supporting the achievement of Corporate objectives, it is important that this is assessed.

#### **Recommendation 8**

Formal service monitoring of the utilisation of the PIR should be undertaken throughout the financial year. This should assess each PIR scheme on both a financial and outcomes basis against milestones set out in business cases. This should be undertaken both in the year in question and in subsequent years for recurrent funding until the milestones and outcomes are achieved. This will provide assurance that the PIR is contributing to Corporate priorities and will provide a flag where action may be required.

#### **Recommendation 9**

An outturn statement of PIR activities should be undertaken corporately on an annual basis. This will provide the Council with an assessment of the contribution of PIR schemes to corporate priorities and will provide assurance over the achievement of agreed outcomes and milestones.

## Appendix 1 - Recommendations and action plan

	*** <i>Significant residual risk</i>	** <i>Some residual risk</i>	* <i>Little residual risk</i>	
	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Management response</b>	<b>Responsibility and timescale</b>
1	Outcomes and performance targets set out in PIR bid business cases should be SMART and incorporate specific targets that can be measured and milestones to facilitate monitoring. These milestones should then be used at Star Chamber to assess the extent to which investment has been successful in achieving priorities. PIR funding of schemes that demonstrate a failure to achieve outcome and contribute to priorities should be reassessed and associated resource should be considered for redirection to further schemes that better support the Bury Plan's priorities.	***	Accepted	DoFEG The recommendation will be implemented as part of the 2009/10 budget setting process
2	Each unsuccessful PIR bid should receive formal feedback to provide services with details of the reasons for its failure. This will provide services with a clear picture of the why individual bids have failed so that they can ensure that future bids are appropriate.	*	Accepted	DoFEG The recommendation will be implemented as part of the 2009/10 budget setting process

## Appendix 1 - Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	<i>Significant residual risk</i>	**	<i>Some residual risk</i>	*	<i>Little residual risk</i>
	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Management response</b>	<b>Responsibility and timescale</b>	
3	<p>The Council should undertake a full review of its Capital Programme, including all morally committed and ongoing schemes, to determine whether each scheme is consistent with, and supports the achievement of, the Bury Plan priorities. This should include an assessment of the outcomes to date of capital investments. Consideration should be given to redirecting funding from schemes that do not wholly contribute to priorities to other scheme bids.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to whether it would be appropriate to require all morally committed and ongoing schemes to re-bid for resource alongside new bids. This will ensure that the Council's capital programme going forwards maximises delivery against priorities.</p>	**	Accepted	<p>DoFEG</p> <p>The proposed review is already underway and will be implemented as part of the 2009/10 budget setting process</p>	
4	<p>Cashable efficiency savings targets should be allocated to services following an assessment of where savings are most achievable rather than on a budget pro rata basis. This will ensure that efficiency targets are realistically set and reduce the risk that the PIR is used to fund unpalatable savings instead of investing in priorities.</p>	**	Not accepted although the practicality of the proposal will be considered by Management Board	<p>DoFEG</p> <p>The recommendation will be considered by the Management Board on 2 June</p>	

## Appendix 1 - Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

	*** <i>Significant residual risk</i>	**	<i>Some residual risk</i>	*	<i>Little residual risk</i>
	<b>Recommendation</b>		<b>Priority</b>	<b>Management response</b>	<b>Responsibility and timescale</b>
5	Services should undertake a bottom up review of the adequacy and appropriateness of budgets to ensure that resource is appropriately directed to activities and that activities support the achievement of priorities. This will facilitate any required realignment of resource within service budgets to ensure that resource is directed from non-priority to priority areas and that individual revenue budgets remain meaningful.	**	**	Accepted in principle and already undertaken in many areas. However resource limitations will mean that a 'priority-led' approach will have to be taken towards wider implementation	DoFEG On-going
6	Successful bids should be subject to separate budget monitoring to demonstrate how resource has been utilised, and to identify the level of resource still available. Consideration should be given to schemes that forecast that they will not utilise resource fully in year to determine what action, if any, is required. Underspends against the PIR should not be allocated against further service budgets or used to prop up the overall budget position of a service. A Corporate reserve list of schemes should be maintained for in-year funding if such resource becomes available.	**	**	Accepted subject to caveats set out in para 6.6 (which also applies to recommendations 7, 8 and 9). Will be reflected in future Corporate Finance and Performance Monitoring reports	DoFEG Effective from 2008/09 Month 3 report (due August 2008)

## Appendix 1 - Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	<i>Significant residual risk</i>	**	<i>Some residual risk</i>	*	<i>Little residual risk</i>
	<b>Recommendation</b>		<b>Priority</b>	<b>Management response</b>	<b>Responsibility and timescale</b>
7	PIR resource allocated to services should be monitored and reported explicitly at Service Star Chamber level. This will enable officers to identify levels of PIR invested in services and facilitate analysis of outcomes versus spend.	***	Accepted	DoFEG Effective from 2008/09 Month 3 Star Chambers	
8	Formal service monitoring of the utilisation of the PIR should be undertaken throughout the financial year. This should assess each PIR scheme on both a financial and outcomes basis against milestones set out in business cases. This should be undertaken both in the year in question and in subsequent years for recurrent funding until the milestones and outcomes are achieved. This will provide assurance that the PIR is contributing to Corporate priorities and will provide a flag where action may be required.	***	Accepted	DoFEG Effective immediately	
9	An outturn statement of PIR activities should be undertaken corporately on an annual basis. This will provide the Council with an assessment of the contribution of PIR schemes to corporate priorities and will provide assurance over the achievement of agreed outcomes and milestones.	**	Accepted	DoFEG Statement to be included in corporate Outturn report effective from 2008/09 report	