

East Sussex County Council
Savings 2017/18 and 2018/19

Department	2017/18 Savings (£'000)	2018/19 Savings (£'000)
Adult Social Care - outside ESBT	1,552	2,257
Business Services/Orbis	1,472	1,396
Children's Services (excl. schools)	3,440	5,335
Communities, Economy & Transport	1,136	2,119
Governance Services	270	134
East Sussex Better Together (ESBT):		
Adult Social Care	7,007	10,164
Children's Services	36	69
Subtotal ESBT	7,043	10,233
Subtotal Departments	14,913	21,474
Capital Programme Management	2,000	0
Subtotal Centrally Held Budgets	2,000	0
TOTAL SAVINGS	16,913	21,474

Public Health

0

0

Adult Social Care: outside ESBT SIP			Gross budget *	Savings		Protected characteristics								
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation	No significant
			£'000	£'000	£'000									
Working Age Adult Ind Sector Care Budgets	Review Learning Disabilities service funding	Potential impact on the levels of care and support funding available to meet eligible social care needs. Reduced choice for service users in the way care and support is delivered and reduced choice of services provided. Reductions in preventative support may result in individuals eligible care needs increasing more quickly. This may place additional pressure on the Community Care budget.	12,861	67	0	-	-							
	Review Mental Health service funding	Potential impact on the levels of care and support funding available to meet eligible social care needs. Reduced choice for service users in the way care and support is delivered and reduced choice of services provided. Reductions in preventative support may result in individuals eligible care needs increasing more quickly. This may place additional pressure on the Community Care budget.		10	0	-	-							
	Fees and Charges			(10)	0									
Working Age Adult Community Care				67	0									
				1,552	2,257									

* The gross budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

East Sussex Better Together (ESBT)			Gross budget *	Savings		Protected characteristics								
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation	No significant relevance
			£'000	£'000	£'000									
Adult Social Care: ESBT Integrated Strategic Investment Plan	ESBT whole system redesign and implementation of integrated health and social care commissioning and delivery	The transformation of the health and social care system at a time of increasing demographic pressures and financial constraint will be challenging. The scale and pace of change required across all services, taking account of the full £864m investment in the health and social care system, will present risks. There will be a need to ensure robust democratic accountability and control, the effective discharge of statutory responsibilities, strong financial control and a clear framework of managing the potential risks of unintended clinical and financial consequences. The formal agreements underpinning the integration will seek to mitigate these risks. There will be potential impacts for service users in how they access services and are supported in the future, which have already been subject to extensive consultation.		7,007	10,164	+/-	+/-			+	+			
Children's Services: ESBT Integrated Strategic Investment Plan	ESBT whole system redesign and implementation of integrated health and social care commissioning and delivery	The transformation of the health and social care system at a time of increasing demographic pressures and financial constraint will be challenging. The scale and pace of change required across all services, taking account of the full £864m investment in the health and social care system, will present risks. There will be a need to ensure robust democratic accountability and control, the effective discharge of statutory responsibilities, strong financial control and a clear framework of managing the potential risks of unintended clinical and financial consequences. The formal agreements underpinning the integration will seek to mitigate these risks. There will be potential impacts for service users in how they access services and are supported in the future, which have already been subject to extensive consultation.		36	69	+/-	+/-		-					
			n/a **	7,043	10,233									

* The gross budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

** The Partnership did not formally exist in 2016//17, therefore no gross budget shown.

Business Services / Orbis - current & additional savings			Gross budget *	Savings		Protected characteristics							
			2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy / Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000								
Orbis Savings	Reconfiguration of services and reduction in staffing for Procurement, Property and Business Operations.	Across Orbis, additional savings are expected to be realised from the procurement budget that will be part of the wider restructure being undertaken in Autumn/Winter 2016/17 to allow for full year savings from April 2017, as these savings will be considered as part of the wider restructure/consultation there will be no addition consultation required. Additional savings will also be delivered from Business Operations through staff reductions in areas to be identified. Within Property, there will also be a number of capitalised work reduced and stopping specific level of Asset feasibility work. As well as to reshape and reduce Asset Teams. ESCC have stated 30% of the overall total Orbis savings, in line with the current ACR.	7,614	217									
ICT Contracts (MOBO)	Review existing ICT contracts to assess opportunities to reduce/share costs across the partnership. Specific areas and impact to be identified but focus will be on overlaps and duplication.	Potential reduction in service levels,	5,895	100									y
Property - Cleaning and Courier services (MOBO)	Review existing contracts to assess opportunities to reduce/share costs across the partnership.	Potential reduction in service levels.	2,318	74									y
Delivery of agile efficiencies by centralising support budgets	Management of telephony, postage and printing budgets. Business Growth.		1,173	100									y
				1,472	1,396								

* The gross budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

Children's Services			Gross budget *	Net budget *	Savings		Protected characteristics								
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2016/17	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation	No significant relevance
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000									
Early Help 0-5	Re-commission Health Visitor contract and achieve significant reduction in the cost (funded by Public Health) and other staffing and non staffing budget reductions.	<p>17/18 Reductions in non-staffing budgets such as travel, printing, equipment etc. Some reductions in Family Key Worker (FKW) posts are unavoidable with the risk that we will reduce our ability to achieve successful payment by results (PBR) troubled family claims. There is also a risk that we will be unable to stop families' needs escalating resulting in the need for more expensive social care interventions. To mitigate this we plan to reduce FKWs in areas where there are the lowest referral rates or where they are working with families with lower level needs. Reductions in agency staffing budgets will result in some Children's Centres opening for shorter hours.</p> <p>18/19 The Health Visitor (HV) contract has to be re-commissioned by April 18. This is funded by Public Health. The contract value will need to be reduced significantly as part of the commissioning process. We believe that savings are possible by a more flexible use of the skills mix, management savings and ceasing work with families that have lower level needs where appropriate. The integration of HV and Children's Centres has been challenging and work is ongoing to embed the changes and there is a risk that coupled with other savings proposals, there could be an adverse impact on performance. There will also be further reductions in management, officer and support posts.</p>			341	1,067	-	-	-	-				-	
Early Help 5-19	Reduction in open access youth work provision, closure of Uckfield Youth Centre, working with D&Bs and housing associations to identify alternative ways to fund and deliver youth services. Management and staff savings achieved through services being delivered more efficiently in house.	<p>17/18 and 18/19 Fewer places to go and things to do for young people. Could increase anti- social behaviour and reduce ability to identify young people who may need targeted 1:1 help. Detached youth work provision will mitigate closure of Uckfield Youth Centre. Some reductions in FKW are unavoidable with the risk that we will reduce our ability to achieve successful PBR troubled family claims and stop families' needs escalating resulting in the need for more expensive social care interventions.</p>	18,928	15,519	269	185	-	-	-	-				-	
Early help 0-19	Consideration of different service delivery models for Early Help Services 0-5 and 5-19 to achieve management and staff savings.	<p>18/19 The financial constraints faced by all Councils have led to some authorities considering alternative models for the delivery of early help and health visiting services. Alternative service models will need to be carefully considered to ensure viability. There is a risk that any changes, coupled with other savings proposals, could have an adverse impact on performance.</p>				350	-	-	-	-				-	

Children's Services			Gross budget *	Net budget *	Savings		Protected characteristics								
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2016/17	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation	No significant relevance
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000									
Support Services, including Admissions, Buzz and Music service	<p>Management and staff savings, efficiency savings linked to agile working, reduced use of external venues, income generation, and training budget reductions.</p> <p>Merger of Complaints and IFF functions to achieve efficiencies and to channel shift most level 1 and 2 enquiries to digital.</p> <p>Reduction in fee remission and review of music service staffing.</p>	<p>17/18 and 18/19 There may also be a reduction in support for operational managers across planning, performance, information management, organisational development and change management. This may lead to reduced responsiveness to requests for information (e.g. Planning, performance, Data Protection Access Requests and Freedom on Information Requests). Reduced ability to support departmental priorities or new initiatives such as absence management, preparation for apprentice levy or external inspections. The reduced training budget and reduced training commissioning function will limit the ability to develop the children's workforce.</p> <p>17/18 Telephone support for enquiries into the Information for Families team will only be provided to the most vulnerable and for those that cannot access information digitally. There will be a focus on channel shifting all other enquiries to our improved web information, advice and guidance.</p> <p>17/18 and 18/19 Fee remission changes are in the process of being implemented with schools picking up the fee remission costs for individual pupils attending their schools (on a phased basis) using pupil premium following consultation with the Schools Forum in January 2016. The staffing arrangements of the music service are currently under review with further savings proposals being developed.</p>			385	296	+/-	+/-	-						
Home to School Transport	Implementing agreed changes to discretionary HTST and review of unsafe routes.	<p>17/18 and 18/19 Savings to Home to School Transport (HTST) as a result of policy changes implemented during 16/17 continue to accrue. Review of unsafe routes will look at whether footpaths and bridleways can be used as safe walking routes to school, therefore reducing HTST costs.</p>	11,708	11,221	488	566	-	-							
Locality	<p>Reductions to S17 budgets that support emergency payments eg accommodation and subsistence costs for families.</p> <p>Reconfiguration of SW posts within teams to reduce numbers of staff.</p>	<p>17/18 and 18/19 Savings are predicated on robust budget monitoring and forecasting. There is a risk that benefit changes could result in pressure being placed on the S17 budget.</p> <p>17/18 Same level of reductions already made in 2016/17. Potential for further increase in caseloads and consequent impact on timeliness of interventions for families and on capacity to make safe decisions.</p>	12,298	11,269	0	381	-	-	-	-					

Children's Services			Gross budget *	Net budget *	Savings		Protected characteristics									
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	2016/17	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation	No significant relevance	
			£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000										
SWIFT and YOT	Income generation from both Public Health and external sources. Reconfiguration of staffing from FKW posts to support court mandated/PLO assessments.	17/18 and 18/19 Income generation will mitigate impact of budget reductions and further opportunities to trade externally will be pursued vigorously. 17/18 and 18/19 May impact on PBR claims for Troubled Families but this will be mitigated by other Early Help services making compensatory increases.	1,675	539	180	134	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Safeguarding and QA unit	Reductions in admin support and reduction in 1fte of Independent Reviewing Officer and Child Protection Advisor (IROs)	17/18 and 18/19 Safeguarding unit reductions are predicated on reduced numbers of LAC and CP plans. Caseloads are already above national averages and given there are currently 9.6 ftes, a further reduction of 1fte is likely to increase caseloads which could result in poor case planning.	1,378	1,265	23	53	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAC	Continued use of robust placement management.	17/18 and 18/19 LAC modelling shows continued reduction in numbers however impact of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children will need to be factored in.	25,106	21,712	823	952	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SLES	Reduction in specialist posts and staff numbers, increase in traded activity and school to school support.	Reduction in SLES school improvement provision will reduce capacity to increase the proportion of good and outstanding schools that will provide capacity for school to school improvement support, and limit the effectiveness of the LA's monitoring of the performance of all schools. This could impact negatively on pupil outcomes, increase the number of underperforming schools and schools in Ofsted categories of concern. Reduction in the statutory provision of Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG) to vulnerable young people will have a significant impact on performance which we will mitigate through the use of online mechanisms for delivering information, advice and guidance to young people. However the impact of limited face to face support and tracking could reduce the participation of vulnerable young people in education, training and employment 16-19.	25,650	2,985	122	218	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ISEND and ESBAS	Reduction in staff posts, reduced placement costs and service redesign in 18/19, plus review of respite care.	Education Support, Behaviour and Attendance Service (ESBAS) will work to mitigate the impact on schools by extending the LA offer of traded work. Reduction in the provision of support to schools for improving behaviour and attendance and in early intervention for pupils facing barriers to engagement. Not all of this work is statutory but helps to manage the demand for expensive, statutory and more costly intervention. Reduction in the Short Term Agency Budget and Short Breaks provision will result in additional pressures on families. Reduction in ISEND assessment and planning may lead to delays in provision beyond statutory timescales but we would mitigate this by working to reduce the number of statutory assessments and plans, through building capacity in schools and colleges to support more young people with school/college based plans. The most significant savings have been delayed to 17/18 and 18/19 in the context of pressures and demands from the current SEN reforms.	45,005	10,102	0	1,230	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	Further vacancy control, reducing travel and other non staffing costs.		152,815	64,604	808	(97)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL					3,440	5,335										

* The budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

Communities, Economy & Transport - current & additional savings			Gross budget *	Savings		Protected characteristics							
			2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage/ Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000								
Registration Services	Create an additional surplus of £60,000 in addition to the current target of £215,800 which has been exceed three years running and is likely to be exceeded again in 2016.17	The Registration service have consistently exceed their income target year on year. This is despite the absence of Southover Grange in Lewes as this is being refurbished. This will be completed as our flagship register office in the Spring/Summer of 2017. The move to Hastings Town Hall in 2016.17 has seen an increase in ceremony income and this is expected to increase again once Southover Grange is open. It has been calculated that an additional £60,000 income should be achievable once Southover Grange is open and Hasting Town Hall continues to increase bookings.	1,262	60									y
				1,136	2,119								

* The gross budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

Governance Services - current & additional savings			Gross budget *	Savings		Protected characteristics								
			2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Age	Disability	Gender / Transgender	Ethnicity	Marriage / Civil Partnership	Pregnancy /Maternity	Religion / Belief	Sexual Orientation	No significant relevance
Service description	Description of savings proposal	Impact assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000									
Communications	Revised services offer and some income generation. Staffing restructure; efficiencies; ceasing part of service.	Ceasing support for departments in relation on-line hub where public can respond to consultations. Impact on effectiveness of consultations and added work for departments. Reduced ability to provide Departments with public/audience insight with effect on marketing efficiency	1,283	130	54									y
Legal Services	Income generation	Additional income generation from review of pricing and greater scale through partnership working. Restructure will mean less resilience, mitigated through development of Orbis Public Law.	2,128	25	50									y
Member Services	Efficiencies, staffing restructure	Reduced resilience and ability to ensure continued service at times of increased demand or staffing shortages.	541	20										y
3rd Sector	Cease corporate support for AiRs (18/19); Reduction in Generic infrastructure or Healthwatch	Reduced support for the VCS.	937		30									y
Senior Management and Organisational Development	Reduce spend on supporting Council developments, innovation, service improvements, resilience.	Reduced funding of innovation or service infrastructure development. Reduction in ability to ensure appropriate governance/M.O. at time of significant and complex change. Reduction in ability to fund external fees resulting in potential additional cost to Depts, particularly Children's Services.	509	50										y
Chief Executives Office	Reduction of across executive support, performance and R&I functions	Less support for Chief Executive and Cabinet. Less capacity for all functions.	952	45										y
				270	134									

* The gross budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

Summary of Equality Impact Assessment for RPP&R 2017/18

Equalities Implications

Following the introduction of the Equality Act 2010 ('the EA') a public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to –

- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the EA;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (as defined by the EA) and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The protected characteristics set out in the EA are as follows:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender Reassignment
- Pregnancy/ maternity
- Race
- Religion or Belief
- Sex
- Sexual Orientation
- Marriage and civil partnership are also protected characteristics for the purposes of the duty to eliminate discrimination.

Prior to making a decision as to which savings proposals should be agreed in the budget, Members must have due regard to the Equality Duty contained in Section 149 of the EA.

Having "due regard" does not necessarily require the achievement of all the aims set out in section 149 of the EA. Instead it requires that Members' understand the consequences of the decision for those with the relevant protected characteristics and consider these alongside other relevant factors when making the decision to pursue one course of action rather than another, alternative, course of action that may have different consequences. The regard which is necessary will depend upon the circumstances of the decision in question, and should be proportionate. Even though not all decisions will be made about which saving proposals to pursue at this stage it is necessary for the Council to begin to understand the potential impacts.

This means that in setting the Budget, the three equality aims set out above must be considered as a relevant factor alongside financial constraints and all other relevant considerations. Members' must have in mind the equalities impacts, and in particular the negative impacts, that agreeing savings will have for those with protected characteristics. Despite maximising efficiency and exploiting new ways of working, the business planning process for 2016/17 and beyond requires difficult choices to be made both within and between portfolios and services.

It is open to the Council to formulate its budget proposals (having regard to the likely impact on protected characteristics, as set out in the table), and then, at the time of developing the policies, the Council will consider in greater detail the specific impact of the proposed policies that might be implemented within the budgetary framework. Assessing the impact of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is not just something the law requires, it is a positive opportunity for ESCC to ensure it makes better decisions based on robust evidence.

The EA does not require an equality impact assessment (EqIA) to be carried out; however, cases considering the public sector equality duty have held that an EIA is the best way to demonstrate that the equalities impacts have been identified and considered. As such an assessment of the likely impacts of proposals or policies on those with protected characteristics will be carried out at a formative stage, and before implementation. In this way, the EIA will form an integral part of the Council's policy setting. Proposals will only be implemented after due regard has been paid to the need to achieve the three aims set out in Section 149 of the EA.

It is open to the Council to formulate its budget proposals (having regard to the likely impact on protected characteristics, as set out in the table), and then, at the time of developing the policies, to consider in greater detail the specific impact of the proposed policies that might be implemented within the budgetary framework.

Where it is the case that decisions as to how achieve savings within the agreed budget limit will be taken in-year, a high level assessment of the equality impacts of the savings is set out within the table attached. Subsequently, specific executive decisions will be taken by the relevant portfolio holders and Directors, and shall be made based on a clear understanding of what the potential impacts of doing one thing rather than another will be for the communities in East Sussex. It will be open to Directors and Lead Members at the time of taking those decisions to spend more on one activity and less or none on another or, where necessary to go back to County Council and invite it to reconsider the allocation to different service areas.

Findings on possible impact from an overall review of savings proposals

The tables attached show the potential impact of the initial, suggested reductions in budgets for each department and highlights that the budget reductions will broadly impact on the 'protected characteristics' of age and disability as people within these groups are those who are most likely to be accessing our services. It is possible that decisions will have a disproportionate impact due to geographic location, or on different communities such as disabled people, younger or older people, BME communities as well as from the cumulative effect of any decisions made.

Members will need to ensure that the impacts on those with protected characteristics and the most vulnerable are considered when either revising or removing current services, or where services transfer to partner organisations. Additional work will be required to identify the impacts on those with protected characteristics, which will take place as policies are developed, following the setting of the revenue budget.

The public sector equality duty set out in the EA is a continuing one, and it will therefore be necessary to monitor the effects of decisions and policies, not only during their formulation, but also after implementation.

In preparing the budget and considering individual savings proposals, Members have, in addition to the Section 149 Public Sector Equality Duty, to consider whether the budget as a whole and the individual savings proposals identified will indirectly discriminate against persons with any of the protected characteristics. Indirect discrimination occurs where a practice, policy or rule of the County Council which otherwise seems neutral (i.e. it applies to everyone affected in the same way) nevertheless places people with one or more of the protected characteristics at a particular disadvantage.

Even where a particular disadvantage has occurred, the proposal will not amount to indirect discrimination if it can be demonstrated that there is an objective justification for the proposal; i.e. that the proposal is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim. Where it can be demonstrated that a particular savings proposal is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim, that proposal will not be indirectly discriminatory. However, if there is no legitimate aim, or if the means of achieving the aim are not proportionate, for a savings proposal which creates a particular disadvantage, that savings proposal would amount to indirect discrimination and would be unlawful under the Equality Act 2010.

The consideration of indirect discrimination has included an analysis of (a) whether there is any particular disadvantage as a result of each relevant proposal, (b) whether there is a legitimate aim and (c) whether the means of achieving the aim is proportionate. The legitimate aims that relate to the savings proposals are:

- the County Council must achieve savings to its budget;
- across the Council's budgets, all areas are facing a reduction in funding (and therefore, looking at the budget more broadly, all protected characteristics will be impacted by reductions in service); and
- the County Council must deliver its statutory services and therefore a significant proportion of the available funding must be used for those statutory services.

Where it has been identified that a proposal may have a particular disadvantage, consideration has to be given as to whether there may be a more proportionate means of achieving these aims. In respect of certain Adult Social Care savings, it is considered that a more proportionate means of achieving the aims identified above would be to use the 3% Adult Social Care precept to mitigate those savings, and this has influenced the final recommendations made. However, in all other respects, it is considered that both the overall budget, and the specific savings proposals identified in are proportionate means to achieve the Council's legitimate aims set out above.