

BUDGET TIMETABLE 2002/3

| Date | ACTION | RO |
|--------------|--|----------------------|
| 30/8 | Finance & Management ❖ Report on out-turn for General Fund & Housing Revenue Account | CFO |
| 31/8 | DEADLINE - Draft Corporate Plan | DCE |
| 5/9 | CMT/Leader meet to discuss Corporate Plan | CE |
| 10/9 | Leadership meeting to discuss Corporate Plan | CE |
| 19/9 | Service Planning Training (1) | CFO/ PBVM |
| 20/9 | COUNCIL – ❖ Submission of Statement of Accounts (2000/1) | CFO |
| 26/9 | Service Planning Training (2) | CFO/ PBVM |
| End Sept | DEADLINE – Budget Guidance to be prepared and distributed to all Divisional Managers. | CFO/ FSM |
| 11/10 | Finance & Management ❖ Consider Corporate Plan | CFO/ FSM/ PBVM |
| 18/10 | Member Seminar to discuss Corporate Plan | CE |
| 24/10 | CMT – consider presentation from Divisional Managers from Development Services on Service Plans i.e John Hansed, David Soanes, John Birkett) | DM |
| 31/10 | CMT – consider presentation from Divisional Managers from Community Services on Service Plans (i.e. Stuart Bachelor, John Morle, Mark Alflat plus Chris Swain, Sally Knight) | DM |
| 1/11 | COUNCIL – consider corporate plan | DCE |
| 7/11 | CMT – consider presentation from Divisional Managers from Development Services on Service Plans (i.e. Jonathon Eatough, Joy Willoughby, Kevin Stackhouse, Tony Stamper, Lesley Wain) | DM |
| 8/11 | Development Services – consider Service Plans for Divisions reporting to Development Services Committee | DCE |
| 15/11 | Community Services – consider Service Plans for Divisions reporting to Community Services Committee | HCS |
| 16/11 | DEADLINE for divisional managers ❖ Submission of Capital and Revenue Growth proposals | DM |
| W/c 19/11 | One day officer meeting to assess capital proposals against agreed criteria | CFO |
| W/c 26/11 | One day officer meeting to assess revenue proposals and savings options against criteria agreed by Finance & Management | CFO |
| 22/11 | Finance & Management Services – consider Service Plans for Divisions reporting to Development Services Committee | CE CFO |
| 30/11 | DEADLINE for ❖ Calculation of Base Budget Position | FSM |
| End Nov | LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT (provisional) | |
| Mid Dec | Service & Financial Planning Working Group (1 day) to be convened to consider savings and growth proposals | |
| Mid Dec | Overview Scrutiny Committee to be convened to comment on proposals but forward by Service and Financial Planning Working Group | |

BUDGET TIMETABLE 2002/3

| Date | ACTION | RO |
|--------------------|---|----------------------|
| 3/1 | Development Services ❖ Consider budget proposals for Development Services ❖ Consider capital bids for Development Services | CFO/ DCE |
| 10/1 | Community Services ❖ Consider budget proposals for Community Services ❖ Consider capital bids for Community Services | CFO/ HCS |
| 17/1 | Finance & Management ❖ Consider F&M budget proposals ❖ Agrees overall budget proposals for consultation ❖ Agree proposed corporate capital programme | CFO/ CE |
| 28/1 | Overview Scrutiny Meeting – invite representations from ❖ Trade Unions ❖ Interested Groups ❖ Business Organisations – merge with Borough & Business Consultation. | CFO/ DCE |
| 31/1 | COUNCIL ❖ Approve Council tax base ❖ Considers District Audit Management Letter | CFO/ RBM |
| End Jan | LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT (final) | |
| 17/1 TO 18/2 | Schedule Area Meeting for public consultaion on budget proposals | LDSM/ CFO/ FSM |
| ?/2 | Overview Scrutiny Meeting – report on consultation process and proposals to Finance & Management – meeting no later than 18/2 | CFO/ DCE |
| 19/2 | Finance & Management ❖ Consider final budget proposals in the light of the Final Local Government finance settlement ❖ Consider representation from Scrutiny Committee ❖ Agree budget proposals for submission to Budget Council ❖ Consider Best Value Performance Plan) | CFO |
| | County Council Budget Meeting | |
| 28/2 | BUDGET COUNCIL ❖ Set Council budget ❖ Agree Best Value Performance Plan | CFO |

PROPOSED SCORING SYSTEM FOR SAVINGS & GROWTH PROPOSALSSAVINGS

(the LOWER the score, the more favourable/easier is the budget reduction)

| | | | <u>Weighted</u> |
|----------|---|---------------------------|-----------------|
| | | | <u>Score</u> |
| 1 | <u>How are the proposed savings achievable</u> | (weighting at 20%) | |
| | Achieved by a significant budget/service reduction (+2/3) | 4 | 20 |
| | Achieved by a more substantial budget/service reduction (1/3 to 2/3) | 3 | 15 |
| | Achieved by a minor budget/service reduction (<1/3) | 2 | 10 |
| | Achieved through efficiency - no negative impact on staffing/resources | 1 | 5 |
| 2 | <u>What will be the impact on the Council's Statutory Responsibilities</u> | | |
| | It will have a major impact | (weighting at 10%) | 3 |
| | It will have some impact | | 2 |
| | There will be a minor impact | | 1 |
| | No impact | | 0 |
| 3 | <u>What will be the impact on Government targets & initiatives</u> | | |
| | It will have a major impact | (weighting at 10%) | 3 |
| | It will have some impact | | 2 |
| | There will be a minor impact | | 1 |
| | No impact | | 0 |
| 4 | <u>What will be the impact on the Council's Key Aims</u> | | |
| | It will have a major impact | (weighting at 25%) | 3 |
| | It will have some impact | | 2 |
| | There will be a minor impact | | 1 |
| | No impact | | 0 |
| 5 | <u>What will be the impact on Service Plans</u> | (weighting at 5%) | |
| | It will have a major impact | | 3 |
| | It will have some impact | | 2 |
| | There will be a minor impact | | 1 |
| | No impact | | 0 |
| 6 | <u>Effects on other Council Services</u> | (weighting at 20%) | |
| | There are knock-on effects for several other services | | 3 |
| | There is some impact on other services | | 2 |
| | The proposal is discrete to this particular service | | 1 |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|----|
| 7 <u>Implementation</u> | (weighting at 10%) | | |
| Date is more than 12 months away | | 4 | 10 |
| Date is within the next 12 months, after 1-4-2002 | | 3 | 7 |
| Can be implemented on 1-4-2002 or very shortly after | | 2 | 4 |
| Can be implemented before 1-4-2002 | | 1 | 2 |

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

(the HIGHER the score, the greater the proposal fits into the Council's ethos)

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|----|
| 1 <u>To what extent are we already committed</u> | (weighting at 10%) | | |
| Totally unavoidable | | 2 | 10 |
| Could ignore/delay at a cost | | 1 | 5 |
| It is avoidable at little or no cost | | 0 | 0 |
| 2 <u>Costs</u> | (weighting at 5%) | | |
| The costs can be fully met by savings elsewhere | | 2 | 5 |
| The costs can be partly met by savings elsewhere | | 1 | 2 |
| None of the costs can be met by other savings | | 0 | 0 |
| 3 <u>For how long is the funding required</u> | (weighting at 5%) | | |
| 1 year only | | 4 | 5 |
| 2 years | | 3 | 3 |
| 3 years | | 2 | 2 |
| On-going | | 1 | 1 |
| 4 <u>Can future efficiencies be made</u> | (weighting at 10%) | | |
| Almost certainly (and these can be reasonably estimated) | | 2 | 10 |
| Possibly (but need investigating) | | 1 | 5 |
| No | | 0 | 0 |
| 5 <u>How much External Finance is available towards the costs</u> | | | |
| 75%+ | (weighting at 10%) | 4 | 10 |
| 50% to 74% | | 3 | 7 |
| 25% to 49% | | 2 | 5 |
| < 25% | | 1 | 2 |
| Nil | | 0 | 0 |
| 6 <u>How certain & secure is it</u> | (weighting at 10%) | | |
| Definitely | | 3 | 10 |
| Possibly (a track record/some evidence is available) | | 2 | 6 |
| Potentially (it needs some investigation) | | 1 | 3 |

| | | | |
|----|---|--------------------|----|
| | | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | <u>Is it Statutory</u> | (weighting at 10%) | |
| | Yes | 1 | 10 |
| | No | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | <u>What contribution will it make to Government targets & initiatives</u> | | |
| | Essential contribution | (weighting at 10%) | 3 |
| | Key contribution | | 2 |
| | Minor contribution | | 1 |
| | No contribution | | 0 |
| 9 | <u>What contribution will it make to the Council's Key Aims</u> | | |
| | Essential contribution | (weighting at 25%) | 3 |
| | Key contribution | | 2 |
| | Minor contribution | | 1 |
| | No contribution | | 0 |
| 10 | <u>What contribution will it make to Service Plans</u> | (weighting at 5%) | |
| | Essential contribution | | 3 |
| | Key contribution | | 2 |
| | Minor contribution | | 1 |
| | No contribution | | 0 |

CAPITAL STRATEGY 2001/2

PRIORITISING CAPITAL SPENDING: ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

EXTERNAL FINANCE (20% Weighting)

1. *Has money been set aside to provide the capital provision for the Council element of the scheme?*

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Resources set aside within Capital Programme |
| 2 | Committee approval with capital resources identified for scheme |
| 1 | Committee approval with no specific resources identified |
| 0 | No approval/resources identified |

2. *How secure is the external finance.*

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Bd accepted – all finance secure or Not reliant on external finance |
| 2 | Major finance – bid accepted and secure |
| 1 | Bid submitted for finance |
| 0 | No bids made |

3. *What conditions apply to the external finance?*

| | |
|---|--|
| 3 | No conditions made – freely available |
| 2 | Few conditions made |
| 1 | Conditions made but steps in place to achieve them |
| 0 | Many conditions affecting the implementation of the scheme |

SUSTAINABILITY (Weighting 30%)

4. *How have the capital costs been assessed?*

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Estimates over the last 12 months with professional input |
| 2 | Estimates produced over 12 months ago but uprated for inflation |
| 1 | Some attempt to estimate costs based on similar schemes |
| 0 | No detailed estimated |

5. *What action could be taken if the final capital costs exceeded the budget?*

| | |
|---|--|
| 3 | Potential to reduce the scheme without a major impact |
| 2 | Reduction in scheme will have a discernible impact |
| 1 | Reduction in scheme will have significant impact on key objectives |
| 0 | No potential to reduce the scheme |

6. *Would other partners increase their contributions if capital costs rose?*

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Potential for increasing contributions – already explored |
| 2 | Potential for increasing contributions – to be explored |
| 1 | Some other funding opportunities available |
| 0 | No potential for increasing contributions |

7. *What assumptions have been made in assessing running costs?*

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Detailed assessment based on experience of similar projects |
| 2 | Indication of costs of similar projects elsewhere |
| 1 | Some attempt to look at experience elsewhere |
| 0 | Lack of detail and little basis on previous projects |

CAPITAL STRATEGY 2001/2

8. **Where running costs are to be covered from existing budgets**
- What will the impact of making reduction elsewhere be?
 - How will reductions be made in time to implement new scheme?

| | |
|---|--|
| 3 | Impact on existing budgets set out clearly and agreed with members |
| 2 | Some detail of initial impact and proposals for implementation |
| 1 | Initial ideas/assessment |
| 0 | No assessment |

9. **To what extent do running costs require an additional growth bid to be approved? ?**

| | |
|---|--|
| 3 | Accommodated within existing budgets |
| 2 | Growth bid made and approved within existing provision |
| 1 | Growth bid submitted and awaiting approval |
| 0 | No bid made |

10. **Where income is anticipated:-**

- On what basis has income been estimated?
- What track record is there to justify anticipated levels of income?
- What is the maximum fluctuation in income and why?
- How will anticipated spending adjust to increases or decreases in income?

| | |
|---|--|
| 3 | Income estimates based on survey. Costs fluctuate with income |
| 2 | Income estimates based on survey but costs do not change |
| 1 | Some attempt made to assess income and show how costs will change |
| 0 | Little detailed estimates. Costs will not change in line with income |

COUNCIL AIMS & OBJECTIVES (Weighting 30%)

11. **What are the main aims and objectives, which the project will contribute towards?**

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Essential contribution to agreed Council aim/objective |
| 2 | Key contribution to agreed Council aim/objective or agreed strategy |
| 1 | Contribution to Council aim/objective or outline strategy |
| 0 | Minor contribution |

12. **If a strategy is mentioned, when was the strategy formally adopted?**

NATIONAL PRIORITIES (Weighting 10%)

13. **What are the main national and regional priorities which the project will contribute towards?**

| | |
|---|--|
| 3 | Essential contribution to agreed National aim/objective |
| 2 | Key contribution to agreed National aim/objective or agreed strategy |
| 1 | Contribution to National aim/objective or outline strategy |
| 0 | Minor contribution |

14. **If a priority is mentioned, when was the strategy formally adopted?**

SERVICE PRIORITIES (Weighting 10%)

15. **What will be the impact of failing to implement the project on:-**

- Agreed Service Plan priorities
- National & Service Plan Performance Indicators/targets

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Essential contribution to agreed Service aim/objective |
| 2 | Key contribution to agreed Service aim/objective or agreed strategy |
| 1 | Contribution to Service aim/objective or outline strategy |
| 0 | Minor contribution |

