



Finance and Corporate Services Scrutiny Board (1)

Time and Date

2.00 pm on Wednesday, 6th February, 2019

Place

Committee Room 3 - Council House

Public Business

1. **Apologies and Substitutions**
2. **Declarations of Interest**
3. **Minutes**
 - (a) To agree the minutes of the meeting held on 28 November and 12 December 2018 (Pages 3 - 8)
 - (b) Matters Arising
4. **Reserve Balances** (Pages 9 - 24)

Briefing note
5. **Consultation Responses: Business Rates Retention Reform and Review of Local Authorities' Relative Needs and Resources** (Pages 25 - 38)

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place)
6. **Work Programme and Outstanding Issues** (Pages 39 - 42)

Report of the Scrutiny Co-ordinator
7. **Any other items of Public Business**

Any other items of public business which the Chair decides to take as matters of urgency because of the special circumstances involved

Private Business

Nil

Martin Yardley, Deputy Chief Executive, Place, Council House Coventry

Tuesday, 29 January 2019

Notes:1)The person to contact about the agenda and documents for this meeting is Carolyn Sinclair, Governance Services, Council House, Coventry, alternatively information about this meeting can be obtained from the following web link:

<http://moderngov.coventry.gov.uk>

2) Council Members who are not able to attend the meeting should notify Carolyn Sinclair as soon as possible and no later than 9am on the day of the meeting giving their reasons for absence and the name of the Council Member (if any) who will be attending the meeting as their substitute.

3) Scrutiny Board Members who have an interest in any report referred to this meeting, but who are not Members of this Scrutiny Board, have been invited to notify the Chair by 12 noon on the day before the meeting that they wish to speak on a particular item. The Member must indicate to the Chair their reason for wishing to speak and the issue(s) they wish to raise.

Membership: Councillors R Auluck, S Bains, R Brown, L Harvard, J Mutton (By Invitation), J O'Boyle (By Invitation), K Sandhu, T Sawdon, R Singh (Chair), K Taylor and R Thay

Please note: a hearing loop is available in the committee rooms

If you require a British Sign Language interpreter for this meeting
OR if you would like this information in another format or
language please contact us.

Carolyn Sinclair

Telephone: (024) 7683 3166

e-mail: carolyn.sinclair@coventry.gov.uk

Coventry City Council
Minutes of the Meeting of Finance and Corporate Services Scrutiny Board (1) held
at 2.00 pm on Wednesday, 28 November 2018

Present:

Members: Councillor R Singh (Chair)
Councillor S Bains
Councillor R Brown
Councillor L Harvard
Councillor K Sandhu
Councillor T Sawdon
Councillor K Taylor

Employees:

People: J McGinley, L Sobierski
Place: V Castree, C Sinclair

Public Business

12. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

13. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2018 were signed as a true record. There were no matters arising.

14. Workforce Strategy Update

The Board received a briefing note and presentation which provided an update on a number of developments relating to the Council's workforce including developments on implementation of the Workforce Strategy, feedback and findings from the recent Employee Engagement survey and leadership development programmes.

Members of the Board questioned officers on a number of matters raised including the following:

- The context and reasons for the framework and how it was similar to or different from previous practice
- Benefits of the leadership development investment
- The low take up of respondents to the 'Your Voice' Survey, how it could be improved and what plans were in place to repeat the survey to be able to compare data.
- Findings from the 'Your Voice' Survey in respect of job pressure and subsequent implications for employees health and wellbeing
- How the 'hot desk' policy was working across Council sites.

Following consideration of the briefing note and matters raised at the meeting, the Board noted the report and requested the following:

- Detailed information on the review of senior managers
- The demographic breakdown of LEO participants and those who had achieved promotions following the programme.
- Information on whether employee surveys would be rolled on a regular basis to allow comparative analysis.
- Information on the previous workforce reform work which had included savings and where this work now sat in the organisation.
- What support was offered to support employees who were absent from the workplace due to stress related conditions.

15. **Work Programme and Outstanding Issues**

The Board noted the Work Programme.

In addition, Members raised an issue in respect of the City Council's 'Switch and Save' energy programme in that there had been a number of reports that energy quotes generated by the programme were higher than users' current energy bills. It was agreed that this be investigated and a report brought to a future meeting.

16. **Any other items of Public Business**

There were no other items of public business.

PRIVATE BUSINESS

17. **Workforce Analytics**

The Board noted a private briefing note which set out the workforce analytics dashboard as at the end of Quarter 2, 2018/19.

RESOLVED that the Board receive the Quarter 3 report for their consideration when it was available.

(Meeting closed at 2.45 pm)

Coventry City Council
Minutes of the Meeting of Finance and Corporate Services Scrutiny Board (1) held
at 2.00 pm on Wednesday, 12 December 2018

Present:

Members: Councillor R Singh (Chair)
Councillor R Brown
Councillor J Clifford (substitute for Cllr S Bains)
Councillor L Harvard
Councillor K Sandhu
Councillor T Sawdon
Councillor K Taylor
Councillor R Thay

Other Members: Councillor J Mutton (Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Resources)

Employees:

People: D Ashmore, A Bellingeri
Place: V Castree, P Jennings, C Sinclair

Apologies: Councillor S Bains

Public Business

18. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

19. Income Generation

The Board considered a Briefing Note which set out details of the City Council's income generating activity and provided an opportunity for Members to look at opportunities to maximise income and make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Strategic Finance and Resources.

Income generation had become an increasingly important part of the financial make-up of councils. Some relaxation of what councils were allowed to do over the past 15 years had provided greater opportunity in this area and the reducing level of Government funding more recently had provided an imperative for such activity.

The Council had been keen to support its own financial position through greater commercial approaches and members have affirmed this approach through the Medium Term Financial Strategy. In 2018/19 it had budgeted to receive £84m through fees, charges, fines, sales, rents, interest and dividends. Although much of this was the result of broadly historic income sources, an increasing amount of income was resulting from relatively new activities. The briefing note provided members information on existing income budgets and commentary on some of the areas of development in relation to income and commercial activity.

The Board questioned officers and sought further clarification on aspects of the document including initiatives for expanding the City Council's trading base, having been successful in providing a payroll services for other organisations and collaborative working with Nuneaton and Bedworth to deliver their domestic recycling service. However, it was noted that there were limits to the extent that the model could be rolled out and should not be seen as a solution to the wider financial problems. Notwithstanding this, the Board considered that officers should look at ways to expand the trading base by promoting services, collaborative working and benchmarking.

The Board also discussed the income earning property assets and potential risks, early payments of pension contributions and treasury investments. Arising from discussions, the Board asked that, where possible, future reports contain details of costs and comparative data.

Following a discussion on pension fund investments and the potential restriction of assets to geographical areas, the Board agreed to consider this matter further at a future meeting.

RESOLVED:

(a) To note the contents of the briefing note

(b) To add an item on Pension Fund Investments/Council assets to the Work Programme

20. Customer Services Update

The Board considered a briefing note which set out actions being taken to improve Customer Service which included an analysis of performance across the area from January to October 2018, benchmarking, staff turnover, customer feedback and initiatives being progressed in respect of the digital agenda.

The document showed that customer service performance had improved since January 2018 in the number of calls answered, capture rates and reduced call wait times. The Board noted there was now a clearer focus on individual performance and on activities around the services.

There was a recognition of the need to drive the digital agenda to support organisational efficiencies and to keep pace with the increasing demand for self-serve options. A Board had been convened to prioritise work which aligned to the One Coventry agenda and the document set out the initiatives being progressed including migration to Skype for Business and E-post solutions.

The Board questioned officers on aspects of the data set out in the briefing note including staff turnover, vacancy rates and customer feedback from analysis of the telephony and online service requests. Arising from discussion, the Board sought to ensure that all service areas would be asked for feedback on Customer Services and, in addition, Customer Services would be asked for feedback on service areas.

RESOLVED that the Board:

- (a) Noted the contents of the briefing note and actions being taken to improve the performance of Customer Services.**
- (b) Request that officers arrange for service areas to provide feedback on the Customer Service Centre and that the Customer Service Centre is asked for feedback on service areas as internal customers.**
- (c) Request that officers look to increase the use of digital in order to improve performance in the Customer Service Centre and look to continuously improve by learning from market leaders in customer services.**

21. Work Programme and Outstanding Issues

The Work Programme was noted.

22. Any other items of Public Business

There were no other items of public business.

(Meeting closed at 3.45 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank



Coventry City Council

Briefing Note

To **Scrutiny Board 1**

Date **6th February 2019**

Subject **Reserve Balances**

1. The Scrutiny Board 1 work programme includes an item to review the position in relation to Council reserve balances. Information has been provided at Appendix 1 which shows balances for each individual reserve area over a three year period. These are listed in order of the size of balance in April 2018 (largest first). In addition a brief description has been provided for each balance.
2. The Council's total level of non-schools revenue reserves stood at **£66.8m** at 31st March 2018 and capital reserves were **£31.2m**. The Council is also required to account for **£24.6m** of reserve balances that belong to the city's schools or are funded from Dedicated Schools Grant and are therefore ring-fenced for schools usage.
3. There are several reserve balances that warrant initial coverage here due to their value.
 - In recent years the Council has implemented programmes of Early Retirement and Voluntary Redundancy to deliver the staffing savings required to balance the budget. A report to Cabinet in November 2015 identified funding for this purpose to cover future years including £12.5m of reserves. Of this total **£8.3m** remains uncommitted.
 - A further **£10.9m** of reserves are held to manage the cash-flow requirements of the financial models for the Council's 3 Private Finance Initiative schemes. These reserves will be used (and the balance will fluctuate) over the 25 year plus lifetimes of the schemes. As part of 2016/17 Budget Setting a decision was taken to utilise £1m per annum for the next ten or so years before then repaying these amounts over the remainder of the schemes' lifetimes.
 - Capital receipts (proceeds from the sale of capital assets) have been generated in recent years and these amounted to **£24.0m** at the end of 2017/18. These receipts have been programmed to fund a number of developments over the coming period including the Council's investment in the Friargate Joint Venture, the planned purchase of Binley Court and the loan arrangements in relation to Coombe Abbey Park Limited.
 - Capital Grant resources of **£7.2m** have been carried forward as reserve balances. These represent income received ahead of the need to spend them. However, the

resources will be required to fund the Council's existing expenditure plans and therefore these resources are committed.

Paul Jennings

Finance Manager Corporate Finance

Reserves Analysis 2017/18

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
<u>Non-Grant Funded Revenue</u>				
Private Finance Initiative	Resources earmarked to support the Caludon Castle, New Homes For Old and Street Lighting PFI schemes over a 25 year period subject to the individual decisions to establish each of these schemes. The schemes' financial models show how these reserves will be utilised over time. 2016/17 Budget Setting approved the cash-flowed use of this reserve at £1m per year and repayment in the mid 2020s which is reflected here.	(11,841,588)	(11,412,609)	(10,909,110)
Pension Strain	Funding for ER/VR costs established as part of Staffing Reductions Consultation Report - Council 9th September 2015.	(12,500,000)	(8,260,627)	(8,260,627)
Corporate - Capital	Resources earmarked to support approved corporate Capital Programme and ICT transformation projects including Superfast Broadband, Far Gosford Street regeneration, Children's Homes refurbishment, Canley regeneration and Disabled Facilities Grants carry forward.	(2,837,082)	(6,066,057)	(6,832,568)
City of Culture Trust & Biggest Weekend	Cabinet approved allocations to fund the 2018 BBC Biggest Weekend (£300k) and Council support for the 2021 UK City of Culture (£4,750k).		0	(5,050,000)

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
BIA additional dividends	Dividend announced at 2015/16 year-end to be used to support Council priorities as part of the Council's Budget Setting. (in addition to on-going dividend of c£1.5m p.a.). Now consolidated into overall corporate resources to fund policy priorities.	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	0
General Fund Balance	The General Fund is held to manage unforeseen risks to the Council's overall financial position. MTFS policy is to retain this at 2% of Net Budget and on this basis.	(3,823,451)	(3,134,366)	(4,701,931)
Kickstart Project	Majority transferred to corporate balances in 18/19. Balance of c£1.2m earmarked as sinking fund for periodic lifecycle costs of One Friargate following £250k annual lifecycle budget being taken as MTFS saving	(2,207,540)	(2,985,988)	(5,067,507)
Business Rates	Budgeted contributions set aside as future protection against Business Rates volatility. Recent significant appeals and the move to 75% Business Rates retention will require further scrutiny that this is adequate.	(2,670,197)	(1,970,197)	(3,414,396)
Insurance recharges	Reserve is currently funding the pressure within insurance caused primarily by loss of income from schools (academies). There is a Pre-Budget Report proposal for 2019/20 onwards to relieve some of that pressure, which together with an appropriation from the insurance provision will increase the reserve, and result in less annual cost each year the reserve is required to fund. However, the balance is required over the medium to long term	(2,401,896)	(1,786,448)	(1,595,899)
Sports Organisations	Initially set up to provide cashflow support to Coventry Sport Trust (Fairfax Street), now earmarked for wider sports portfolio inc investment in Gym equipment at Moat House, set up costs for CCDLF and opportunities to reduce Prudential borrowing costs	(875,602)	(893,256)	(1,598,814)

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
General Events	Amount approved as part of 2015/16 Budget Setting to support capacity building in the cultural sector. Resources will be fully utilised in 18/19 as the city readies itself for the City of Culture and also against the cost of the rising cost of Godiva festival	(930,000)	(583,671)	(128,574)
AD - Property & Asset Management	NA - nil balance	(706,000)	(549,557)	0
People Directorate Programme Team	This balance represents the Transition Fund established as part of the Connecting Communities Programme, with a clear process of applications and award to organisations.	(500,000)	(485,217)	(368,034)
CSWDC	Now consolidated into overall corporate resources to fund policy priorities.	(892,141)	(428,094)	0
Corporate Balances	Includes £3.8m of resources not yet allocated. Remainder of the balance includes amounts set aside for Workforce Reform , 2017/18 Tariff reduction to be repaid to Govt and Coventry & Warwickshire Growth Hub Funding	(473,049)	(406,080)	(4,793,820)
Transformation Programme Office	This balance is held to fund the short term cost of external consultants or employ temporary posts to support transformational activity following a budget reduction of £400k to the transformation team.	(300,000)	(300,000)	(267,415)
Elections	Smoothing Reserve to manage volatility of Elections costs which vary with fallow year and with timing of grant funded national elections. Previously separate reserves for PCC and European elections. All now merged into this reserve.	(130,300)	(245,435)	(400,715)

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
Development Services	NA - nil balance	(192,723)	(192,723)	0
Business Services	Balance required to fund transformational activity to support digitalisation of services including new kiosks in Customer Services Centre as part of transforming Customer & Business Services	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)
External Funding and Business Development Team	Reserves earmarked together with core revenue as match funding to lever in new grant. Will be drawn down on following indicative profile £157k 18/19, balance 19/20.	(183,257)	(155,525)	(158,870)
C&W Ent & Bus Growth Programme Management	NA - nil balance	(154,417)	(154,417)	0
Planning Policy	remaining balance committed and will be fully used in 18/19	(140,000)	(140,000)	(75,000)
Commercial Property (exceptional items)	Repair and maintenance resources set aside and drawn down in 2018/19	(160,000)	(118,000)	(312,000)
Sustainability & Low Carbon Team	Earmarked to pump prime the funding of staff costs which will be used as match funding for grant income generation and selling business sustain services, which will help achieve the service MTFS commercialisation targets	0	(74,000)	(127,658)
S4G - skills for growth programme	To be drawn down into revenue to support the programme.	(68,507)	(60,371)	(105,040)
Taxi Licensing	Ringfenced Account - legal requirement	(143,549)	(49,813)	(32,557)

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
Heatline Project	NA - nil balance	(28,542)	(28,542)	0
Training Children's Services Commissioning	This has not been required in 2017/18 and as it stands there is no commitment against it.	(122,671)	(20,000)	(20,000)
SEN and Disability Information and Advice Support Service	This resource is ring-fenced as part of the contract with the Council for Disabled Children (CDC) to support the Information, Advice & Support Service (IASS) to enable it to fulfil its duties outlined in the Children & Families Act 2014. We have agreed with CDC that the resource will continue to fund a role to service users in 2018/19.	(18,017)	(17,782)	(9,748)
Resources Mgt Team & Overheads	Using this underspend, and some currently unused staff hours, we were able to secure the post in the short term for an additional year, whilst the LA agreed that it is an important post to continue in the longer term in light of the wider responsibilities brought about by the 2014 act towards children & young people.	0	(2,155)	(2,155)
Community Safety External Funding	NA - nil balance	(16,247)	(438)	0
Corporate - Children's & Edu Srvcs (EDU Portfolio)	NA - nil balance	(2,000,000)	0	0
CIF - recyclable resources	NA - nil balance	(161,308)	0	0
Voluntary Grants review	NA - nil balance	(133,768)	0	0

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
TESS	NA - nil balance	(109,737)	0	0
Coroners	NA - nil balance	(72,157)	0	0
Strategic Transportation	NA - nil balance	(56,360)	0	0
OP Residential Care Placements	NA - nil balance	(50,238)	0	0
Benefits Administration	NA - nil balance	(39,261)	0	0
Cost Centre: PCC Election	NA - nil balance	(35,777)	0	0
Outdoor Education Centre	Contribution towards the 50th Anniversary capital redevelopment to reduce level of borrowing to be funded from the revenue in future years.	(31,841)	0	(46,991)
Employment - Youth Service	NA - nil balance	(12,467)	0	0
Customer Services Centre	NA - nil balance	(604)	0	0
Financial Management Team	NA - nil balance	(363)	0	0

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
Construction Shared Apprenticeship	To be drawn down into revenue alongside other balances to support the scheme	0	25,516	(40,690)
Coventry Sports Trust	Negative reserve, due to be repaid from Sports funding model at the rate of £65,000 pa - Cabinet 19th July 2011 refers	425,000	360,000	295,000
Coventry City Centre Regeneration	City Centre South Project resources. Original decision awarded £880k to deliver CCS Cabinet approval. There is potential to draw down future development costs from the CA allocation however this balance needed to de-risk any ineligible project development costs	0	0	(175,958)
PC Replacement Programme	This represents the smoothing reserve used to manage the rolling corporate programme of PC replacement.	0	0	(450,000)
The Employment Support Service (TESS)	Balance (£89,375) as at July 2018 - this reserve was approved corporately for TESS to act as match funding to leverage in grant. The remaining balance is needed for 19/20.	0	0	(208,375)
		(51,170,657)	(44,710,851)	(55,034,453)
<u>Capital</u>				
Useable Capital Receipts Reserve	Receipts generated over last few years held for future investments/acquisitions in the capital programme e.g. Coombe, Friargate and City of Culture. Alternatively can be used to reduce Prudential Borrowing/fund existing commitments as part of 19/20 Budget Setting	(6,659,825)	(20,489,046)	(23,977,836)

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
Capital Grants Unapplied Account	Grant funding received in advance of spend, whereby there are no specific grant conditons to spend in the year. The funding reflects the decision made as part of the Council's Corporate Capital Programme.	(5,735,534)	(9,737,044)	(7,179,261)
		(12,395,359)	(30,226,090)	(31,157,097)
<u>Grant Funded Revenue</u>				
Joint Social Care and Health schemes funded through s256, Care Act Grant and Better Care Fund	The majority of this balance represents the iBCF resources received in 2017/18 that were reprofiled based on the Cabinet Report on 1/8/17. The resources are managed through the Adult Joint Commissioning Board	(1,468,322)	(1,647,257)	(5,612,282)
Public Health Staffing & Overheads	Resources for a number of different elements including balances held with the Clinical Commissioning Group and West Midlands Association of Directors of Public Health (£123k), resources supporting match funding against other grants (£163k), resources to fund the Activity in Parks Programme (£147k) and £100k to support the Coventry & Warwickshire Wellbeing Programme. Also includes s256 resources with the CCG managed through the Childrens Commissioning Board and are committed to be spent in 2018/19	(1,036,578)	(739,754)	(604,933)

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
Adult Ed Income including Grants/Fees	The year end for Adult Education is 31 July 2018. ESFA then undertake a review of delivery over the academic year and adjust resource accordingly. This can result in a clawback of resource, which could be in excess of £100K. Current budget plans for 18/19 utilise £250K of this, and it is recommended that the remaining is held in reserve pending a better understanding of potential changes to funding allocations from August 19 when the resource has transferred to the combined authority.	0	(718,834)	(900,287)
DFE - Troubled Families	5 year grant programme. The funding is committed in future years as part of the programme of delivery.	(701,151)	(685,724)	(485,724)
SEN Reforms Grant	This includes the monies for SEND Reforms, and the money is being used to part fund the structure in the SEN statutory team and associated services. It also includes the West Midlands Regional monies for SEND, the spending plan is agreed on a regional basis. It also includes resource to improve pathways to employment for young people with SEND. this is specifically focusing on the development of supported internships. £96K of this resource has also been built into the High Needs budget setting for 2018/19.	(573,239)	(619,305)	(721,570)
DEFRA Recycling Champions	Awaiting comms from service manager	(652,350)	(565,679)	(413,175)
Individual Electoral Registration		(295,979)	(476,938)	(341,542)
CSW Sport - Management Costs	This balance is hosted account on behalf of 7 partners within Coventry Solihull and Warwickshire Sport. It is not City Council money.	(469,446)	(403,713)	(341,958)

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
ESF Ambition Project - Project management team, provider payments and internal projects	Majority earmarked for grant clawback risk, the outcome of which will be known during 17/18. Some earmarked as additional core match funding	0	(197,000)	(141,618)
SALIX Project	Not City Council resources. A revolving fund to provide small energy saving initiatives funding with paybacks	(80,001)	(122,206)	(166,755)
AD - City Centre & Development	NA - nil balance	(61,191)	(61,191)	0
Business Improvement District (BID)	NA - nil balance	(10,683)	(54,427)	0
Fuel Poverty Grant & DECC Fuel Poverty Project	Switch & Save initiative. Further activity planned	(30,755)	(30,755)	(27,385)
Employment - Families	NA - nil balance	(200,000)	0	0
Strategy, Commissioning and Transformation Mgt Team	NA - nil balance	(72,000)	0	0
Home Office-Proceeds of Crime Scheme	Match funding for PCC Grant	(40,559)	0	(60,958)
LEP Support	NA - nil balance	(25,600)	0	0
Surface Water Management	NA - nil balance	(14,214)	0	0
Early Years Service	NA - nil balance	(7,932)	0	0

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
Independent Living and Practice Development	This is made up of 3 elements of funding received to support development of Social Workers as well as funding for part of a post. Funding has come from Cov Uni, BCF and Skills for Care	0	0	(42,064)
Migration Project B	£171k is required to be carried forward to allow delivery of the requirements of the education grant conditions for the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme and the Resettlement of Vulnerable Children's Scheme, for children arriving in the City since November 2017	0	0	(171,000)
Trading Standards & Consumer Protection	To be moved into revenue 2018/19.	0	0	(5,394)
Connect Me	Earmarked for grant clawback risk, the outcome of which will be known during 2018/19. Some earmarked as additional core match funding	0	0	(54,276)
Children in Need Targetted Support	The CiN project received an allocation of £64,894 for the financial year 2017/18. Due to a reprofiling of the project, total spend to date was higher resulting in a debit balance. The overspend is due solely to profiling / timing issues and will be recovered over the life of the project.	0	0	64,257
Legal Services - Place & Regulatory Team	Community Safety Grant funding for Civil Order works	0	0	(7,406)
Exceed in Coventry	Majority earmarked for grant clawback risk, the outcome of which will be known during 18/19. Some earmarked as additional core match funding	0	0	(10,769)
Air Quality Early Measures	Grant funding has been fully allocated, additional funds are being sought.	0	0	(551,472)
Routes to Ambition	Majority earmarked for grant clawback risk, the outcome of which will be known during 18/19. Some earmarked as additional core match funding	0	0	(30,023)

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
Controlling Migration Fund	The Council along with all other asylum dispersal cities was recently invited to bid for £100,000 to support the appointment of two Local Authority Asylum Support Liaison Officers. The primary focus of these officers is to deliver a tailored support service for new refugees to facilitate their transition into mainstream society during their move on period by providing advice and information on essential services.	0	0	(100,000)
Lifelong Links	Following these principles, Coventry City Council submitted a successful bid focussing on the importance of connecting asylum seekers to available services whilst they live in the City and preparing them in advance for both a positive and negative decision from the asylum process through these officers.	0	0	(451,838)
Preventing Homelessness	This reserve holds the preventing homelessness grant which is being used to implement changes to Housing & Homelessness legislation	0	0	(555,187)
		(5,739,999)	(6,322,782)	(11,733,360)
Schools				
Schools (specific to individual schools and ELCs)	Dedicated Schools Grant Reserves owned and controlled by individual schools and Education Learning Centres. Subject to existing legal framework for schools. Reported to Schools Forum.	(19,983,903)	(18,127,267)	(19,583,519)
Schools (related to expenditure retained centrally)	Dedicated Schools Grant Reserve central expenditure reserve. Grant must be used to support the Schools Budget as defined in the School and Early Years Finance Regulations. Usage is reported to and monitored by the Schools Forum.	(6,082,515)	(4,643,909)	(4,852,318)
SEN Alternative Provision (APB) - moved to Schools balances on this analysis	SEN Alternative Provision - part of schools balances	(9,951)	(161,146)	(205,593)

Title	Revised Description	Apr-16	Apr-17	Apr-18
		(26,076,369)	(22,932,321)	(24,641,430)
		(95,382,384)	(104,192,044)	(122,566,338)

This page is intentionally left blank



Public report

Finance and Corporate Services Scrutiny Board (1)
Cabinet
Council

6th February 2019
12th February 2019
19th February 2019

Name of Cabinet Member:

Cabinet Member for Strategic Finance and Resources – Councillor J Mutton

Director Approving Submission of the report:

Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

Ward(s) affected: None

Title:

Consultation Responses: Business Rates Retention Reform and Review of Local Authorities' Relative Needs and Resources

Is this a key decision?

No

Executive Summary:

The Government issued two consultation documents on 13th December 2018 entitled "Review of Local Authorities' Relative Needs and Resources" and "Business Rates Retention Reform". The consultations form part of the Government's over-haul of local government finance which is due to take effect in the financial year 2020/21. This will incorporate an overall settlement determined by the 2019 Spending Review, new baseline funding allocations for individual local authorities informed by an up-to-date assessment of their relative needs and resources and the impact of a new 75% Business Rates retention model. Responses are required by 21st February 2019 and the Council's proposed responses are attached as Appendices 1 and 2.

The significance of the outcome of such a consultation make it important for the Council to add its own response. The majority of the consultation questions focus on detailed technical aspects of the potential funding arrangements. Given the lack of transparency of the current funding model and the length of time that it has been in operation, it is not possible to draw firm conclusions on the likely impact of any changes to funding arrangements implied by the Council's responses. The expectation should be that such a review results in a system that is evidence based, robust and fair and the Council's proposed responses are aimed at achieving such an outcome.

Recommendations:

Finance and Corporate Services Scrutiny Board (1) is recommended to:

- 1) Consider the report and make any recommendations to Cabinet

The Cabinet is recommended to:

- 1) Consider comments and recommendations from the Finance and Corporate Services Scrutiny Board (1).
- 2) Recommend to Council that they approve the attached consultation response to be sent to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

Council is recommended to:

- 1) Approve the attached consultation response to be sent to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

List of Appendices included:

Appendix 1: Consultation response - Review of Local Authorities' Relative Needs and Resources
Appendix 2: Consultation response – Business Rates Retention Reform

Other useful background papers:

None

Has it been or will it be considered by Scrutiny?

Yes - Finance and Corporate Services Scrutiny Board (1), 6th February 2019

Has it been or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?

No

Will this report go to Council?

Yes 19th February 2019

Report Title: Consultation Response: Business Rates Retention Reform and Review of Local Authorities' Relative Needs and Resources

1. Context (or background)

1.1 The Government issued two consultation documents on 13th December 2018 entitled "Review of Local Authorities' Relative Needs and Resources" and "Business Rates Retention Reform". The consultations form part of the Government's over-haul of local government finance which is due to take effect in financial year 2020/21. This will incorporate an overall settlement determined by the 2019 Spending Review, new baseline funding allocations for individual local authorities informed by an up-to-date assessment of their relative needs and resources and the impact of a new 75% Business Rates retention model. Responses are required by 21st February 2019 and the Council's proposed responses are attached as Appendices 1 and 2.

2. Options considered and recommended proposal

2.1 There are two options, to respond or not to respond. Given the significance of the outcome of such a consultation it is important for the Council to add its own response and this is the recommended option.

2.2 The responses are attached at Appendices 1 and 2. The expectation should be that such reviews result in a system that is evidence based and fair. On this basis the proposed responses to the consultation questions are intended to be technical in nature and/or are framed in such a way that are directed at achieving a rational and fair outcome. It is in the interests of Coventry and of the wider local government community to achieve such an outcome. If the consultations result in models that were distorted by particular interest groups this would not provide a robust basis for the local government finance mechanism going forward.

2.3 The response incorporates the following broad elements:

- Notwithstanding 'how' resources are allocated in any new system, the most important factor is 'how much' funding is available. This will be determined by the Spending Review rather than the outcome of these consultations.
- The system must continue to protect authorities with higher needs and which may end up being 'losers' between baseline resets.
- The new arrangements should push for a more dynamic system with regular refreshes, up to date data, baseline resets and quicker 'transitions' (e.g. not damping that goes on for ever).
- The response makes the point that arguments from some authorities around sparsity and negative Revenue Support Grant (RSG) are not evidence based and should not be allowed to distort the outcomes.
- Councils should gain the benefit or bear the cost of local decision making (so resource needs should be assessed using notional assumptions of Council Tax not actual levels and not adjusting for local decisions on Council Tax Support).
- The response argues against fees and charges being adjusted for within the system on the basis that it is impossible to measure their impact reliably.
- The response argues for partial and phased element of resets and for Councils to keep the majority of Business Rates growth that results from local economic growth.

3. Results of consultation undertaken

3.1 No specific consultation has been undertaken.

4. Timetable for implementing this decision

- 4.1 The consultation responses are required to be made by 21st February 2019. The revised local government finance system is due to come into force from financial year 2020/21.

5. Comments from Director of Finance and Corporate Services

5.1 Financial implications

From 2020/21, local government finance settlements will be determined by the way in which the finance model is constructed, influenced by some of the issues dealt with in the consultations. Although local councils will be in a position to influence their overall financial position to some degree, in most cases this will be a secondary consideration to the resource starting point provided by the model. The proposed response does not seek to challenge the fundamental premise of a redistributive system.

The indicative position suggested by the information available at a whole Government level is that local government funding will continue to be under pressure beyond 2019/20. This will be further informed by the Government's Spending Review which will be announced sometime over the summer of 2019 and the results of the review of the overall local government finance system in the autumn of 2019.

5.2 Legal implications

There are no specific legal implications resulting from the report.

6. Other implications

Any other specific implications

6.1 How will this contribute to achievement of the Council's Plan?

The consultation will not impact directly on the Council's Plan but future funding decisions will determine the financial parameters within which the Council will operate from 2020/21.

6.2 How is risk being managed?

There is some risk that any revised local government funding model may adversely affect the Council. It is not possible to predict the outcome of this and the Council will continue to adopt relatively prudent financial assumptions for 2020/21.

6.3 What is the impact on the organisation?

The consultation will not impact directly on the organisation but future funding decisions will determine the financial parameters within which the Council will operate from 2020/21.

6.4 Equalities / EIA

Future funding decisions will determine the financial parameters within which the Council will operate from 2020/21 based on an assessment of needs across a number of areas of activity. This could have a positive or negative impact on the level of resources allocated to services to people including groups with protected characteristics but it is not possible at this stage to predict this.

6.5 Implications for (or impact on) the environment

The consultation will not impact directly on the environment.

6.6 Implications for partner organisations?

The consultation will not impact directly on partner organisations.

Report author(s):

Name and job title: Paul Jennings, Finance Manager (Corporate Finance)

Directorate: Place Directorate

Tel and email contact: 02476833753 paul.jennings@coventry.gov.uk

Enquiries should be directed to the above person.

Contributor/approver name	Title	Directorate or organisation	Date doc sent out	Date response received or approved
Contributors:				
Phil Baggott	Lead Accountant	Place Directorate	21/1/19	21/1/19
Lara Knight	Governance Services Co-ordinator	Place Directorate	21/1/19	21/1/19
Names of approvers for submission: (officers and members)				
Finance: Barry Hastie	Director of Finance and Corporate Services	Place Directorate	21/1/19	
Legal: Carol Bradford	Corporate Governance Lawyer	Place Directorate	21/1/19	23/1/19
Director: Martin Yardley	Deputy Chief Executive	Place Directorate	29/1/19	29/1/19
Members: John Mutton	Cabinet Member Strategic Finance and Resources		18/1/19	18/1/19

This report is published on the council's website:

www.coventry.gov.uk/meetings

Consultation Response: Review of local authorities relative needs and resources

Coventry City Council supports the principle that a local government finance system should enable the delivery of decent services to local people. Such a system relies upon two fundamental factors - an adequate overall allocation of resources and a robust and equitable system to allocate those resources.

On the first of these measures, reduced revenue funding over recent years and increased demand pressures across local government have led to an overwhelming view in the sector that the current level of funding is insufficient. The Government has not provided an indicative value for the overall level of local government funding beyond 2019/20 although independent analysis of future Government funding levels suggests that local government will continue to suffer reductions. Therefore, however equitable the resource allocation system, the Council's concern is that the majority of local authorities will be faced with an inadequate level of funding from 2020/21.

There is a point worth repeating that the significant level of uncertainty, the very large potential scale of change and the lateness with which local government is likely to be informed of settlement information make this a very unsatisfactory process from councils' point of view, notwithstanding any transition arrangements. This is no way to run very large public sector organisations.

The Council notes, with disappointment, the Government's continued support in the areas of rural delivery grant and so called negative RSG 'compensation'. These have no evidence base to support them and they do not appear to contribute to delivery of a fair funding settlement within the existing system. It will be crucial that such spurious constructs are not included in the proposals going forward.

It is recognised that the consultation involves complex issues that even experienced and expert practitioners have found challenging. For the most part the worlds of Business Rates Retention and Needs and Resources may have been considered in isolation from each other. However, there are some issues that may enable at least a degree of synergy in terms of the timing and nature of baseline refreshes (for instance, the interaction of partial and phased resets). If this has not already been considered our view is that it is worth at least cursory consideration to see if a more holistic funding system can be developed.

Detailed responses to the consultation questions are included below:

1. Do you have views at this stage, or evidence not previously shared with us, relating to the proposed structure of the relative needs assessment set out in this section?

In broad terms the approach taken in the relative needs assessment appears to be logical and the Council has only a small number of comments on the proposals. The Council's view is that as a minimum deprivation should be included as a cost driver across a significant proportion of the overall relative needs assessment but, in particular and preferably, deprivation should be incorporated within the Upper Tier Foundation Formula.

The consultation refers to future proofing being one of the key elements of the needs assessment. In this respect Coventry has experienced very significant recent cost increases in relation to homelessness which we understand have been felt in a number of other authorities. If this is a theme raised by other authorities we would request consideration of whether this issue is adequately reflected within the new system.

It is fair to say that the length of time that has elapsed since the needs assessment was refreshed and the opaqueness that exists in the current system makes it impossible for an objective and evidence based view to be drawn on a comparison between the current and newly proposed systems.

It is also worth noting that, to the extent that the needs assessment has previously provided for the absolute needs of local communities, the reductions in funding within the system over recent years mean that the relative needs assessment will inevitably result in the allocation of an insufficient overall level of funding.

2. What are your views on the best approach to a Fire and Rescue Services funding formula and why? Question

Coventry is not a Fire and Rescue Authority and does not have an authority specific view on a Fire and Rescue funding formula.

3. What are your views on the best approach to Home to School Transport and Concessionary Travel?

The Council supports the proposed approach to carry out further analysis on potential alternative approaches in order to determine whether this approach adequately reflects local authorities' relative needs.

4. What are your views on the proposed approach to the Area Cost Adjustment?

The Council supports the principle of an Area Cost Adjustment to reflect differences in local cost bases, where this is supported by sufficient significance and variability. However, in our view the Area Cost Adjustments should not be determined through any separate or parallel statistical analysis, which could risk double counting the importance of factors such as rurality/sparsity/remoteness. We acknowledge that the factors listed in the consultation, in relation to ACAs, could all have the potential to explain variations in spending pressure. However they should be brought into the same overall statistical assessment of factors, rather than analysed separately.

5. Do you agree that the Government should continue to take account of non-discretionary council tax discounts and exemptions (e.g. single person discount and student exemptions) and the income forgone due to the pensioner-age element of local council tax support, in the measure of the council tax base? If so, how should we do this?

We agree that the Government should continue to take account of existing non-discretionary elements in the measurement of the council tax-base. We also agree that an adjustment should be introduced in relation to the income foregone due to the pensioner-age element of local council tax support. It is important that these adjustments are applied annually based on the most up to date information available.

6. Do you agree that an assumptions-based approach to measuring the impact of discretionary discounts and exemptions should be made when measuring the council tax base? If so, how should we do this?

The Council favours an approach that enables the financial impact of local decisions to be contained at a local level. Therefore an assumptions based approach should be used to measure the impact of discretionary decisions. This will involve an assumption that a common approach has been taken across all authorities in order to avoid taking direct account of local policy choices.

7. Do you agree that the Government should take account of the income forgone due to local council tax support for working age people? What are your views on how this should be determined?

In line with the response to question 6. We do not agree that the Government should take account of the income foregone due to local council tax support for working age people. There is no logic in enabling Council's to have local discretion over such a scheme and then adjusting for this at a national level.

8. Do you agree that the Government should take a notional approach to council tax levels in the resources adjustment? What are your views on how this should be determined?

Consistent with the response to question 7, the Council agrees with the consultation's view that a notional assessment of council tax levels should be applied when making the relative resources adjustment. Using a notional council tax level, would mean that local authorities with similar tax bases and a similar assessment of relative needs would receive broadly similar baseline funding levels, irrespective of their actual council tax levels.

Our understanding is that the existing resource allocation system (as originally implemented) was based on the use of the arithmetic mean of a notional council tax level. If this is not the chosen method, the Council's preference would be for the notional approach to be applied in a way that supports greater equalisation of funding relative to assessed need.

It is worth adding that the Council's view is that the argument set out in the consultation document around authorities paying 100% of their business rates baseline as a tariff is a bogus one. This position is purely an arithmetic outcome which does not in itself demonstrate that affected authorities have been in any way disadvantaged by funding formula (current or future).

9. What are your views on how the Government should determine the measure of council tax collection rate in the resources adjustment?

The Government should use an assumed collection rate not actual collection rates. In this way councils will remain incentivised to maximise collection.

10. Do you have views on how the Government should determine the allocation of council tax between each tier and/or fire and rescue authorities in multi-tier areas?

Coventry is not a multi-tier authority and does not have an authority specific view on the allocation of council tax between tiers.

11. Do you agree that the Government should apply a single measure of council tax resource fixed over the period between resets for the purposes of a resources adjustment in multi-year settlement funding allocations?

We do not agree that the Government should apply a single measure fixed over the period. Such an approach increases the likelihood of significant resource changes at the end of each reset period instead of these being experienced more incrementally each year. Instead the Council would prefer to see projections of council tax resources included within a revised system. This could include projections on a partial basis or on a phased basis, potentially in line with one of the approaches being explored for business rates resets.

12. Do you agree that surplus sales, fees and charges should not be taken into account when assessing local authorities' relative resources adjustment?

The Council recognises and has some sympathy with the case set out in the consultation document for taking into account local authorities' ability to raise sales, fees and charges when assessing local authority relative resources. However, the arguments against doing

this are persuasive ones. The Council's view is that the relatively limited scale of such income, the challenges of measuring it, the degree of potential volatility and the disincentive impact on councils are such that sales, fees and charges should not be taken into account when measuring relative resources.

13. If the Government was minded to do so, do you have a view on the basis on which surplus parking income should be taken into account?

Legislation already exists for applying surplus parking income and a range of other sources of income. The Council's view is that it would be inappropriate to treat any one of these income sources in an exceptional way.

14. Do you agree with the proposed transition principles, and should any others be considered by the Government in designing of transitional arrangements?

Transition arrangements in the form of damping, continue to exist in the existing funding arrangements despite the fact that these arrangements were established many years ago. Therefore, while recognising the need for a degree of funding stability the Council's view is that the need for transition arrangements to be time-limited is of paramount importance. Transparency should be a fundamental expectation of transitional arrangements and should include the total level and individual council levels of transitional funding.

15. Do you have views on how the baseline should be constructed for the purposes of transition?

We welcome the intention to engage with the sector to arrive at the best measure for setting the baseline. However, the Council would be strongly opposed to the baseline including elements of funding that are not and have never been supported by an evidence based assessment of needs and resources. These include damping that has not been unwound from previous resets of the local government finance system. It also includes more recent funding decisions (sometimes in the form of specific grants) in relation to Rural Services Delivery Grant and Negative RSG 'compensation'. The Council's view is that these elements have been included in recent settlements in response to vocal submissions from parts of the local government community but which are not justified by the available evidence base in terms of an assessment of needs and resources.

16. Do you have any comments at this stage on the potential impact of the proposals outlined in this consultation document on persons who share a protected characteristic? Please provide evidence to support your comments.

The content of the consultation does not provide a basis for making any specific comments on this aspect.

Consultation Response: Business rates retention reform

Coventry City Council supports the principle that a local government finance system should enable the delivery of decent services to local people. Such a system relies upon two fundamental factors - an adequate overall allocation of resources and a robust and equitable system to allocate those resources.

On the first of these measures, reduced revenue funding over recent years and increased demand pressures across local government have led to an overwhelming view in the sector that the current level of funding is insufficient. The Government has not provided an indicative value for the overall level of local government funding beyond 2019/20 although independent analysis of future Government funding levels suggests that local government will continue to suffer reductions. Therefore, however equitable the resource allocation system, the Council's concern is that the majority of local authorities will be faced with an inadequate level of funding from 2020/21.

There is a point worth repeating that the significant level of uncertainty, the very large potential scale of change and the lateness with which local government is likely to be informed of settlement information make this a very unsatisfactory process from councils' point of view, notwithstanding any transition arrangements. This is no way to run very large public sector organisations.

It is recognised that the consultation involves complex issues that even experienced and expert practitioners have found challenging. For the most part the worlds of Business Rates Retention and Needs and Resources may have been considered in isolation from each other. However, there are some issues that may enable at least a degree of synergy in terms of the timing and nature of baseline refreshes (for instance, the interaction of partial and phased resets). If this has not already been considered our view is that it is worth at least cursory consideration to see if a more holistic funding system can be developed.

Detailed responses to the consultation questions are included below:

1. Do you prefer a partial reset, a phased reset or a combination of the two?

The Council has previously indicated its support for a partial reset of the Business Rates system as one way of ensuring recognition of the growth made by authorities since the last reset. We remain of the view that for local communities to feel the benefits of economic growth, authorities must be able to build the majority of the resulting income into their base budgets. A phased reset introduced alongside a partial reset may help to smooth the impact of volatile movements and we would welcome the intention to undertake further modelling to better understand the implications of such options.

The Council's response to the relative needs and resources consultation that has run alongside this one has proposed consideration of a similar scheme for Council Tax, that is, one that incorporates a combination of partial and phased resets. There could be benefits in deploying similar and congruent approaches across Council Tax and Business Rates that would help both schemes and the sector's understanding of the overall system.

2. Please comment on why you think a partial/ phased reset is more desirable.

Our view is that the system could contain an element of both approaches which would help to avoid significant shocks both within and at the end of each reset period.

3. What is the optimal time period for your preferred reset type?

It is essential that if resets are to remain as part of the system, that these are timely to enable baselines to be aligned to resourcing needs – in line with revaluations would make sense. We have previously indicated support for resets at maximum intervals of five years although the Government's subsequent announcement that revaluations will take place every three years provides an updated position on this.

If phased annual resets are introduced, this will effectively take away the need for fixed periodic resets.

It is worth repeating our previously stated view that any system should ensure that any authority which experiences a reduction in income must not be required to retain any losses after a reset has taken place.

4. Do you have any comment on the proposed approach to the safety net?

The indicated safety nets that apply to each of the existing schemes appear to be in within a sensible and manageable range. The Council's view is that the safety net should continue to be funded through a levy on growth so that those authorities that benefit most from the scheme should be asked to cover the cost to those that benefit the least.

5. Do you agree with this approach to the reform of the levy?

We support a system that combines a strong growth incentive that enables authorities to retain a significant proportion of the growth that can reasonably be attributed to their management of their local economy and plans to levy growth that is considered to be extraordinary.

6. If so, what do you consider to be an appropriate level at which to classify growth as 'extraordinary'?

Without ready-access to the supporting information it is difficult to draw an objective conclusion on this subject. However, even the lowest of the suggested options appears to be towards the high-end of a reasonable range for consideration.

7. What should the fall-back position be for the national tier split between counties and districts, should these authorities be unable to reach an agreement?

Coventry is not a multi-tier authority and does not have an authority specific view on the allocation of council tax between tiers.

8. Should a two-tier area be able to set their tier splits locally?

Coventry is not a multi-tier authority and does not have an authority specific view on the allocation of council tax between tiers.

9. What fiscally neutral measures could be used to incentivise pooling within the reformed system?

The Council would expect support for existing devolutionary plans to be a key part of future Government plans. However, we are not convinced that pooling is necessarily an essential feature of plans for devolutionary collaboration.

10. On applying the criteria outlined in Annex A, are there any hereditaments which you believe should be listed in the central list? Please identify these hereditaments by name and location.

The Council is not aware of any such hereditaments.

11. On applying the criteria outlined in Annex A, are there any listed in the central list which you believe should be listed in a local list? Please identify these hereditaments by name and location.

The Council is not aware of any such hereditaments.

12. Do you agree that the use of a proxy provides an appropriate mechanism to calculate the compensation due to local authorities to losses resulting from valuation change?

The Council understands that the Government is proposing all changes to an authority's local list backdated to the first day of the list (i.e. the beginning of the revaluation cycle) are regarded as a proxy for valuation only change. This will inevitably result in an imperfect system, recognising that any proxy cannot be 100% accurate. However, in the absence of better information the Council accepts that use of a proxy is likely to be the best compromise solution to this issue.

13. Do you believe that the Government should implement the proposed reform to the administration of the business rates retention system?

The Council recognises the significant complexity in the proposals considered under this question and the significant amount of work undertaken by the Business Rates Retention System Design Working Group. In the relatively short time-scale available to consider this consultation it is difficult to give definitive views on the proposed way forward and the alternatives discussed. However, the Council does not have any fundamental objections to several of the key elements of the proposal such as earlier provision of NNDR data and subsequent floating top-up and tariff payments.

14. What are your views on the approach to resetting Business Rates Baselines?

The Council's view is that the approach to this subject area should be informed by the historical data on appeals provisions available to the Government. This would give an indication of the number and value of outliers created by different approaches. Therefore it seems sensible for the Business Rates Retention Implementation Working Group to continue to work towards a preferred solution as suggested.

15. Do you have any comments at this stage on the potential impact of the proposals outlined in this consultation document on persons who share a protected characteristic? Please provide evidence to support your comments.

The content of the consultation does not provide a basis for making any specific comments on this aspect.

This page is intentionally left blank

Please see page 2 onwards for background to items

4th July 2018
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Customer Service Improvement - Digital First
12th September 2018
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Medium Term Financial Strategy
28th November 2018
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Workforce Strategy Update - Workforce Analytics Dashboard (private)
12th December 2018
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Customer Service Improvement - Income Generation
6th February 2019
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Council Reserves - CCC responses to Local Government Consultations on <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Local Government Fair Funding Review 2) Business Rates Retention
13th March 2019
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Business Rates - ICT Update to include ICT Strategy - Social Value Act - Procurement Strategy
Date to be Determined
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budget – meeting savings targets - Capital Programme - Coventry City Council Apprenticeships - Digital maturity/capability (2019/2020) - Workforce Analytics - Asset Investment including West Midlands Pension Fund

Date	Title	Detail	Cabinet Member/ Lead Officer
4th July 2018	- Customer Service Improvement	To include the actions being taken to improve Customer Service, including work by other Service Areas. To include reference to the Household Survey results to raise the voice of the citizen.	David Ashmore
	- Digital First	To look at longer term plans to improve digital across the Council. Paper to include feedback from other Directorates on their role in moving towards digital first. Also include use of third party apps, such as fix my street, rather than reinventing the wheel. Include work being undertaken to address Digital Inequality.	David Ashmore
12th September 2018	- Medium Term Financial Strategy	To discuss the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy prior to its approval through the political process.	Paul Jennings
28th November 2018	- Workforce Strategy Update	To review the Workforce Strategy including the results of the 2018 staff satisfaction survey and an update on the impact of the Leadership Development Investment discussed in March 2018.	Grace Haynes
	- Workforce Analytics Dashboard (private)	To present Members with the Workforce Analytics Dashboard.	Grace Haynes
12th December 2018	- Customer Service Improvement	To follow on from the July item and scrutinise whether there has been an improvement in performance. To include reference to benchmarking, aborted call times and a breakdown by service area of performance.	David Ashmore
	- Income Generation	To look at opportunities to maximise income - identified at meeting 18/04/18	Barrie Hastie
6th February 2019	- Council Reserves	To receive an update on the position of Council Reserves.	Paul Jennings
	- CCC responses to Local Government Consultations on	To look at CCC's draft responses to two consultations on Local Government Fair Funding Review and Business Rates Retention before they go to Cabinet on 12th February and Council on 19th February.	Paul Jennings

Date	Title	Detail	Cabinet Member/ Lead Officer
	1) Local Government Fair Funding Review - 2) Business Rates Retention		
13th March 2019	- Business Rates	To discuss the changes to Business Rates.	Paul Jennings
	- ICT Update to include ICT Strategy	For SB1 to be involved in the development of the ICT Strategy which is to include SMART Targets and Benchmarking. The Board have also requested information on ICT Service Level Agreements and the Asset Register.	Paul Ward/ David Ashmore
	- Social Value Act	To examine the extent to which the Social Value Act is delivering added value and how we can maximise opportunities to increase social value.	Mick Burn
	- Procurement Strategy	To scrutinise the delivery of the Council's Procurement Strategy	Mick Burn
Date to be Determined	- Budget – meeting savings targets	To scrutinise whether the Council is on track to meet its savings targets.	Barry Hastie
	- Capital Programme	For the Board to receive a written report updating the Board on the Capital Programme, including information on WMCA programmes.	Paul Jennings
	- Coventry City Council Apprenticeships	To consider the apprenticeships being offered by the City Council. To look at how the young people employed are supported to get the maximum value from their placements.	Grace Haynes
	- Digital maturity/capability (2019/2020)	Work to be scoped by the Chair.	Paul Ward/ David Ashmore
	- Workforce Analytics	Following on from the meeting on 12 th December 2018, Members requested a further update on Workforce Analytics.	Grace Haynes/ Julia McGinley
	- Asset Investment including West Midlands Pension Fund	Following on from the meeting on 12 th December 2018 this item is to look at asset investment in the West Midlands and Coventry (including inviting a representative from WMPF)	Paul Jennings

