

<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Executive Director</b>	Donna Ball
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	Cllr Quinn

## Section A

<b>Service Area</b>	Waste Management and Transport
<b>Budget Option Description</b>	Growth in vehicle maintenance provision to additional customers

### Budget Reduction Proposal – Detail and Objectives

In the quest to find additional savings in 2023/24, Operations have considered further savings in terms of a more strategic, intelligence-based approach to public service reform that will deliver further efficiencies. Most local authorities no longer rely solely on “in house” operations to deliver services turning to alternative approaches. These include the use of “shared services”, between multiple local authorities and between local authorities and other public bodies; outsourcing to private or voluntary providers, and its opposite, “insourcing”; the increasing use of Local Authority Trading Companies (LATCs) to trade for profit, providing a revenue stream for the local authority; and mutuals. Whilst outsourcing was popular 20 years ago, there is increasing evidence that many Councils are insourcing their services. In 2019, APSE estimated that 77% of UK councils were planning to bring services back in-house and calculated that between 2016 and 2018, at least 220 local government contracts had been brought back into council control. 78% of local authorities believe insourcing gives them more flexibility, two-thirds say it also saves money, and more than half say it has improved the quality of the service while simplifying how it is managed.

In England and Wales, section 113 of the Local Government Act 1972 enables a local authority to enter into an agreement with another authority to place its officers at the disposal of the other authority, subject to consultation with the staff concerned and negotiation about any changes in terms and conditions. More recently, the Government published a strategy for shared services in 2018. This had three main rationales: delivering value and efficiency, convergence around processes and data, and meeting end user needs.

Other Local Authorities currently contract out some vehicle maintenance work to the private sector and we are currently in discussions to identify if our vehicle maintenance workshop could undertake this work and deliver a saving to them, whilst increasing income to the Bury vehicle maintenance workshop and admin support. Discussions are currently ongoing about the support we can provide and a saving for 2023/24 has been proposed based on the anticipated outcome of these discussions which will be concluded shortly.

	2023/24	2024/25
Budget Reduction (£m) increased income	£0.100	
Staffing Reduction (FTE)	0	0

## Section B

***What impact does the proposal have on:***

<b>Property</b>
None.
<b>Service Delivery</b>
Capability to undertake the additional workload.
<b>Organisation (Including Other Directorates/Services)</b>
None.
<b>Workforce – Number of posts likely to be affected.</b>
None – may require additional business support and an extra technician to pick up the additional work.
<b>Communities and Service Users</b>
None.

<b>Other Partner Organisations</b>
To be confirmed.

## Section C

### Key Risks and Mitigations

Risks	Mitigations
Timescale to explore, determine and execute.	Additional capacity to undertake the work.
Local Authorities and organisations are not prepared to take the option forward.	Looking to try and make the proposal financially benefit both parties. Further meetings in place to understand appetite.

The work provided from other Local Authorities not meeting the £100k.	A number of options have been supplied to other Local Authorities and organisations.
---	--

## Key Delivery Milestones

*Include timescales for procurement, commissioning changes etc.*

Milestone	Timeline
Determine options and viability	31 December 2022
Due governance re: a decision	28 February 2023
Implementation	1 April 2023

## Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start Date	End Date
Staff	TBC	TBC
Trade Unions	TBC	TBC
Public	No	No
Service User	No	No
Other	No	No

## Equality Impact

*Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate/ adverse impact on any of the following?*

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No

People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or undergone a process or part of a process of gender assignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

<b>EIA Required?</b>	<b>No</b>
----------------------	-----------

---

## Section E

### *Financial Implications and Investment Requirements*

<b>Investment requirements – Revenue and Capital</b>
None
<b>Finance Comments – Will the proposal deliver the savings and within the agreed timescales?</b>
Initial indications are that the target savings are deliverable. However, there is an element of risk here until the detail is confirmed with other local authorities.