



THE LONDON BOROUGH
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Steve Wood
stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4316

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 9 January 2017

To: Members of the
**PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kim Botting FRSA, David Cartwright QFSM, Mary Cooke, Hannah Gray,
Will Harmer, Tom Philpott and Richard Williams

Non-Voting Co-opted Members –

Katie Bacon, Bromley Youth Council
Millie Banians, Bromley Youth Council
Terry Belcher, Safer Neighbourhood Board
Kate Frail, Bromley Victim Support
Dr Robert Hadley, Bromley Federation of Residents Associations
Alf Kennedy, Bromley Neighbourhood Watch

A meeting of the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny
Committee will be held at Committee Room 1 - Bromley Civic Centre on
WEDNESDAY 18 JANUARY 2017 AT 7.00 PM

MARK BOWEN
Director of Corporate Services

*Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>*

PART 1 AGENDA

Note for Members: Members are reminded that Officer contact details are shown on each report and Members are welcome to raise questions in advance of the meeting.

STANDARD ITEMS

- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**
- 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3 QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIRMAN FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions to this Committee must be received in writing 4 working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please ensure questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on 12th January 2017.

4 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 29TH NOVEMBER 2016 (Pages 1 - 14)

5 MATTERS ARISING (Pages 15 - 18)

6 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

7 POLICE UPDATE

8 PRESENTATION FROM BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE

9 PRESENTATION FROM CHALLENGER TROOP

HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT

10 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions to this Committee must be received in writing 4 working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please ensure questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on 12th January 2016. .

11 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF PORTFOLIO HOLDER REPORTS

The Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder to present scheduled reports for pre-decision scrutiny on matters where she is minded to make decisions.

a PPS DRAFT BUDGET 2017/18 (Pages 19 - 32)

b EXTENSION OF DOGS SERVICES CONTRACT (Pages 33 - 40)

c ANIMAL WELFARE--LICENCE FEES FOR HOME BOARDERS (Pages 41 - 44)

d CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING-2ND QUARTER 2016/17 (Pages 45 - 50)

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS

12 REVIEW OF THE EMERGENCY PLANNING AND BUSINESS CONTINUITY SERVICE (Pages 51 - 60)

- 13 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION UPDATE**
- 14 INTERNAL AUDIT STRAY DOGS REVIEW REPORT (Pages 61 - 88)**
- 15 WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER (Pages 89 - 94)**
- 16 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- 17 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The Committee will meet next on 1st March 2017

.....

This page is left intentionally blank

PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 29 November 2016

Present:

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kim Botting FRSA, David Cartwright QFSM,
Mary Cooke, Hannah Gray, Will Harmer and Tom Philpott

Terry Belcher, Dr Robert Hadley and Alf Kennedy

Also Present:

Councillor Robert Evans, Linda Gabriel, Chris Hafford,
Councillor Kate Lymer, Dr Agnes Marossy, Victoria
Roberts and Aileen Stamate, Constanze Sen, Laura Austin
Croft, Sarah Morgan, Nigel Davies, Rob Vale

STANDARD ITEMS

103 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Katie Bacon from Bromley Youth Council.

Apologies were received from Cllr Tim Stevens, and Cllr Mary Cooke attended as substitute.

Apologies were also received from Cllr Richard Williams.

104 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

105 QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIRMAN FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

There were no questions for the Chairman from Councillors or Members of the Public.

106 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 28th SEPTEMBER 2016

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee held on 28th September 2016.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 28th September be agreed.

107 MATTERS ARISING

CSD 16162

The Committee noted the update on matters arising from previous meetings.

A member referred to the defibrillators that had been mentioned in the minutes. He requested that the PDS Committee take a closer look at the use of defibrillators in Bromley, as they were not expensive. He asked if LBB could roll out more defibrillators in selected locations, and the proposal was seconded. It was agreed that the Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services investigate what could be done in terms of increasing the number of defibrillators in selected locations

It was noted that all of the matters arising had now been actioned, and that they could all be closed.

RESOLVED that the Matters Arising report be noted and that the Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services investigate the provision of defibrillators in selected locations.

108 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

The Chairman updated the Committee as follows:

The Chairman attended the LIFE Passing out Parade at Lee Green Fire Station on Thursday 13th October. Participants were put through their paces in a mock emergency house fire rescue and then each one was presented with their achievement portfolio.

On Wednesday 2nd November, the Chairman held an agenda planning meeting with the Executive Director for Environment and Community Services and other officers to consider items for the meetings on 29th November and for the remainder of the 2016-17 Council year.

The Chairman participated as an observer in the Underage Sales Test Purchases exercise held on Saturday 29th October 2016. She visited various retail outlets within the Borough, two of which sold age-related goods to the two volunteers. The Chairman praised the excellent work done by the Trading Standards Team but acknowledged that there could be no complacency and that the need to educate retailers about the sale of under-age goods was ongoing.

109 POLICE UPDATE

The Borough Commander updated the Committee as follows:

The latest MOPAC crime data had been disseminated to members of the Committee prior to the meeting at the request of the Chairman.

It was noted that there had been an increase in the reporting of DV cases with violence, and also of ASB. The percentage of calls answered within 15 minutes was 89.6%, and the number of calls answered within 60 minutes was 85.5%.

The Borough Commander highlighted that out of 32 forces, there were only three that had been able to report an overall crime reduction with respect to the MOPAC 7 targets, and Bromley were one.

It was noted that advertising was underway to recruit for the position of a new Chief Commissioner. It was anticipated that the selection process would be completed by February 2017. The current Deputy Police Commissioner was acting, and it was likely that the person selected would be an external candidate.

Proposals for the new Basic Command Units (BCU) were gathering pace in an effort to save £400m. Twelve BCUs were planned, but no specific information was currently available to clarify which borough Bromley would be linked to. The Committee was briefed that it was likely that the boroughs of Camden and Islington would be the first to amalgamate. It was anticipated that the boroughs of Redbridge, Havering and Barking/Dagenham would follow in February 2017, and would be the first tri borough BCU.

BCUs would consist of 4 divisions:

- Neighbourhood Policing
- Emergency Response
- Local Investigation
- Protecting Vulnerable People

The Neighbourhood Policing division would incorporate youth policing and the use of Ward Officers. The Emergency Response Team would be a team that would operate across borough boundaries. The Local Investigation Team would be taken from the current CID. The CID would decrease in size so that some officers could be used in the new division that was focusing on protecting vulnerable people.

It was hoped that the new BCU structure would improve information and intelligence sharing. The Mayor and Deputy Mayor were in favour of the new BCU structures, and the 4 divisions corresponded to Mayoral priorities. The posts of Chief Inspectors and Commanders were being abolished. The

Borough Commander briefed the Committee that Mr David Tait (currently Chief Inspector for Neighbourhood Policing) was leaving Bromley police to take up the post of 'Chief of Staff' for the delivery of the World Athletics Championships.

It was noted that as a result of the recent Ofsted report into Children's Services in Bromley, three new officers were being recruited into roles that would be dealing with the prevention of the abuse and exploitation of children and young people.

In terms of staffing, Bromley police were losing 17 PCSOs next month, as part of a corporate process. There would still be 33 PCSOs left, which meant that there was still enough resource to have at least one PCSO per ward. Three PCSOs had been allocated to Bromley Town centre and three to Orpington.

The Committee was briefed about a recent traffic enforcement operation that had been undertaken called 'Operation Patia' which had taken place for one hour per day. During the course of the operation, 48 individuals had been reported for driving and using a mobile phone, and 7 cars had been seized as they were not insured.

A member asked if Bromley police had any control over which forces they could be joined with as part of the BCU structure, and if marked or unmarked cars were being used for the mobile phone operation. The Borough Commander clarified that Bromley police did not have the luxury of choosing who they would be linked in with as part of the BCU structure, and that in the operation against mobile phone usage unmarked cars were used.

The Chairman expressed concern about being linked with Croydon, as it was anticipated that Croydon would have heavy demand. She wondered if the BCUs could be based on the administrative links that currently existed within the GLA.

The Vice Chairman raised the issue of ASB in his ward (especially problems linked to the anti-social use of motor bikes) and expressed dismay that the matter was not a Mayoral priority. The Borough Commander responded that the use of Ward Officers would make a difference, combined with the use of off the road motor bikes. Five tasking teams had also been formed to deal with the problem.

A member expressed concern that the police (like other organisations) seemed to be continually restructuring, and that this was not always beneficial. He put forward the view that relationships with partners could be damaged, and that it may be better to focus simply on delivery. The Borough Commander noted the point, but stated that the police were directed by the Mayor and the Home Secretary. It was the case that the BCU structure would give rise to various savings, including management costs.

A member asked if any of the 17 PCSOs that were being moved were now planning to leave the police. The Borough Commander answered that 1

PCSO had stated that he/she was going to leave the service, but this had not happened yet. The Borough Commander promised to update the public and LBB when more information became available concerning the BCU composition.

A member asked about various entry schemes into the Met. and asked if it was true that some entrants were going straight in at Superintendent level. The Borough Commander responded that although a scheme of that nature did exist, it was not the case that entrants would enter immediately at this level; they would work as constables initially, and then work their way up. A member expressed concern that new entrants on such schemes may be exposed to difficult and violent incidents without sufficient experience and training to deal with such situations. The Borough Commander noted the point, but stated that he was aware of external candidates on such schemes, who had been involved in difficult incidences, and had performed very well.

A member flagged up the problem of motorcycles racing at speed up and down Orpington High Street. Residents in the Knoll area had been particularly vocal in complaining about this, and the issue needed addressing.

RESOLVED that the police update be noted.

HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT

110 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

There was a question to the Portfolio Holder from Dr Robert Hadley.

The question and answer is attached as Appendix A to the minutes.

a BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2016-2017

FSD 16073

The Budget Monitoring report provided an update of the latest budget monitoring position for 2016/17 for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio based on expenditure and activity levels up to 30th September 2016. This showed an under spend of £20k. This was because the latest approved budget for the Portfolio was £2.093m, and the projected outturn was £2.073m.

The Portfolio Holder was requested to endorse the latest 2016/17 budget projection for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder endorse the latest 2016/17 budget projection for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.

111 REPORT ON ALCOHOL ABUSE

Report ES 16069

The report was written by Dr Agnes Marossy (Consultant in Public Health) to provide information about alcohol abuse in Bromley. Members of the Committee were asked to consider and comment on issues outlined in the report.

The Committee heard that alcohol related harm was determined by:

- The volume of alcohol consumed
- The pattern of drinking
- The quality of the alcohol consumed

The 'mechanisms of harm' were explained as:

- Toxic effects on organs and tissues
- Intoxication
- Dependence

The Committee was informed that the factors affecting alcohol consumption and alcohol related harm were age, gender and familial risk factors. Drinking behaviours were classified in three ways—lower, increasing and higher risk. Classification could also be undertaken by virtue of the degree of dependence.

Dr Marossy explained that recent data collected from GPs indicated that only 42.2% of individuals had been asked about alcohol consumption over the last three years, so it was not really possible to draw definite conclusions about alcohol consumption in Bromley. Members looked at statistical data that showed that the number of people consuming alcohol over the recommended weekly limit was least in Darwin Ward, and greatest in the Hayes and Coney Hall Ward. There was no local data for Bromley on binge drinking. It was the case that young people aged 16-24 were more likely to consume more than the recommended weekly limit of alcohol in one day.

The Committee were concerned to hear of the conditions for which alcohol was a causal factor:

- Various cancers—mouth, throat, stomach, liver and breast cancer.
- Cirrhosis of the liver
- Heart Disease
- Depression
- Stroke
- Pancreatitis

Alcohol abuse was also linked to mental health issues and suicide.

The Committee was concerned to learn that excessive alcohol consumption was a major cause of premature death. Liver disease was one of the leading causes of death in England, and people were dying from it at younger ages. The rate of alcohol related hospital admissions was increasing at national, regional and local levels, but the rate remained lower in Bromley, than for London and the rest of England. The Committee noted that excessive alcohol consumption had socio-economic impacts which included harm to individuals, and harm to society at large. Members were also briefed on the treatment and management of alcohol misuse.

The Committee was informed that in Bromley, many of those requiring structured treatment for alcohol misuse were in regular employment (37%). This compared favourably with the national figure which was 29%. It was also noted that in Bromley, more individuals were commencing treatment with housing problems than in other parts of the country.

The Committee was dismayed to learn of the financial burden imposed upon the UK as a result of alcohol abuse which was £21bn. Some positive news was that the number of alcohol specific admissions involving the under 18s was reducing. Dr Marossy explained that there were three different types of prevention which were:

- Primary—consisting of Education and Licensing
- Secondary—consisting of early detection and screening
- Tertiary—consisting of treatment services

It was generally a good thing if individuals received treatment for a period of six months, as three months was generally considered too short to successfully complete the course of treatment.

With regard to individuals accessing the service for harm reduction only (not dependent drinkers):

- Between July 2015 and June 2016, there were 74 individuals drinking at higher risk levels who received support from the service.
- Of these 64.9% were male and two thirds were between 35 and 54 years of age.
- Many of this group had stable backgrounds, i.e. stable housing (75.7%), a stable employment situation (44.6%), and no identified safeguarding issues (51.4%).
- Referrals were mainly from the GP (37.8%) or self-referrals (31.1%).

Dr Marossy explained that a strategic review of alcohol services in Bromley was being undertaken. This review would use the 'CLeaR' Framework. 'C' referred to the process of **Challenging** local services that delivered interventions to prevent or reduce alcohol-related harm.

'L' referred to '**Leadership**' – this domain considered the extent to which strategic leadership was supporting comprehensive action to reduce alcohol harm. It looked at local structures and arrangements to assess whether commissioning decisions were informed by a robust understanding of local need and to evaluate the strength of partnership working, and the governance structures underpinning this. R referred to '**Results**' – this domain looked at the data used locally to evidence the outcomes delivered by the partnership against national and local priorities and would reflect on emerging local trends.

The Committee heard that the key to successfully dealing with alcohol abuse in LBB was to actively involve all relevant partners which were identified as:

- Elected Members
- Local Authorities
- Public Health
- Health and Wellbeing Boards
- CCGs
- Primary Care
- Hospitals
- Treatment Services
- Mental Health
- Police
- Courts, Prison and Probation Services
- Children and Family Services
- Housing Support
- Job Centre Plus
- Voluntary Sector

Any member of the Committee that would like to visit Bromley Drug and Alcohol Service (BDAS) were advised to contact Jonathan Williams, Service Manager.

Jonathan.Williams@cgl.org.uk

The Chairman asked Dr Marossy what she thought about the changes in the law that permitted 24 hour consumption of alcohol in the UK. Dr Marossy responded that this was a difficult issue to contain if the police were not objecting to Licensing applications, and noted that there was no Public Health element in the legislation. It was difficult to assess the impact of 24 hour drinking as there was a different drinking culture in the UK compared with the rest of Europe.

A Member enquired if there was a plan or strategy that was being developed in relation to Town Centre drinking. Dr Marossy responded that this was the remit of Licensing and not Public Health. Drinking was not illegal, and it did create jobs and stimulate the night time economy, so a balance was required. The police could look at how to deal with crime and physical violence.

The Chairman considered that Planning was an important issue to consider, and that planning permission should not be given for too many vertical drinking establishments; she felt that a café type culture should be encouraged. A member expressed the view that many publicans were now going out of business. Dr Marossy mentioned that people were making their own choices—alcohol was cheap to buy and many people were now choosing to drink at home.

A member referred to the Alcohol Reduction Programme and asked what sort of follow up was undertaken, as it was crucial to see if the interventions undertaken were successful or not. Dr Marossy agreed that the outcomes were important, but this data was not available on the night.

A member asked how accurate the data was as many people underestimated the amount of alcohol that they consumed. Dr Marossy noted the point and stated that there was an issue around data collection, as many people did not understand what was meant by units of alcohol.

The Chairman asked if the School Alcohol Education Programme was effective. Dr Marossy answered that this was difficult to assess, but it was the case that fewer hospital admissions were being reported. The Chairman was concerned to note that there was an issue concerning the consumption of alcohol by pregnant women, and enquired if there was any sort of education in place to help with this. Dr Marossy advised the Committee that some help and advice was offered at the time of ante-natal screening.

The Vice Chairman asked if reduction in alcohol strengths was beneficial. Dr Marossy felt that this could have the effect of slight reductions in risk, and would support continued reductions.

It was suggested that Bromley Youth Council may like to consider the topic of alcohol abuse for a future campaign.

RESOLVED that the report on Alcohol Abuse in Bromley be noted.

**112 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN
 AND GIRLS SERVICES**

ES 16068

The report was written to provide an update on the Domestic Violence (DV) and Violence against Women and Girls (VAWG) contracted services and project work for the Safer Bromley Partnership.

The report additionally provided background information to the PDS Committee on the strategy for Domestic Violence (DV) and Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) and the strategic aims of the London Borough of Bromley.

The Committee was asked to note the contents of the report for information purposes.

The Committee was informed that the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 placed a statutory requirement on local authorities to monitor the level of domestic abuse in their communities and to establish partnerships, in order to reduce the problem and work together with other agencies to highlight the issue and coordinate responses. Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) came into effect on 13 April 2011. The Safer Bromley Partnership had the responsibility for establishing domestic homicide reviews within Bromley. A VAWG Strategy (2016-2019) had now been completed and would be ratified by the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group. When completed, the VAWG Strategy would incorporate the domestic violence and VAWG strategic aims from the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Assessment 2016-2019.

The Committee was appraised that the Service was in its fourth year of funding, and that the funding was set to end in March 2017. The VAWG Steering Group had been relaunched, as had the VAWG Forum. Figures taken from July 2015 to June 2016 showed that there had been 4,800 victims- 89% of these had been medium risk and 11% had been high risk and referred to MARAC.

Members were briefed that MOPAC funding for 2017/18 would mirror that which was received in 2016/17, which was £257,730. The funding was expected to reduce by 40% in 2018/19. No further details had been released regarding funding subsequent to this. Due to future uncertainties, it had been proposed to tender the service for a contract term of one year, with options to extend for a further two single years. Members noted the proposed service specification which had been approved by the Commissioning Board, E&R PDS and the Executive.

The Chairman was very concerned about the proposed 40% drop in funding for 2018/19. She wondered why this was the case if these issues were a Mayoral priority. The Portfolio Holder stated that it was hoped that opportunities would exist to reclaim funding via co-commissioning.

A member enquired if referrals were increasing. The Interim DV Commissioner clarified that reporting had gone up, probably due to an increased awareness of referral pathways. It was also now the case that referrals were coming in with respect to older people due to cases of elder abuse. Another member stated that as referrals were increasing, it would be worrying if cuts took place. She felt re-assured that the Portfolio Holder had the financial issues under control. There was a generic view amongst committee members that the service should not be cut.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

113 PRESENTATION FROM BROMLEY WOMEN'S AID

The presentation from Bromley and Croydon Women's Aid was given by the CEO, Constanze Sen.

The presentation commenced with a presentation of various statistics pertaining to domestic abuse, followed by data that was specific to BCWA.

The following services were provided:

- ▶ Refuge Accommodation & Support
- ▶ Child Support Services
- ▶ Schools Programme
- ▶ Community Outreach Support
- ▶ Domestic Abuse One Stop Shop
- ▶ Support Groups
- ▶ Awareness & Training

The Committee was informed that a new holistic service had been set up in 2016—'Breaking Down Barriers'. There were four aspects to the service:

- Services for women with complex needs
- Services for women that had no recourse to public funds
- Specialist support for young women and girls
- Training and awareness

Lottery funding had been provided for four positions within this service.

Funding for BCWA came from a variety of sources which included:

- ▶ Rental Income
- ▶ Big Lottery Fund
- ▶ London Borough of Bromley
- ▶ DCLG
- ▶ MOPAC
- ▶ BBC Children in Need
- ▶ Trusts and Foundations
- ▶ Community groups
- ▶ Churches
- ▶ Local Businesses

Members of the Committee were briefed on the financial cost of domestic abuse, which impacted across the whole of the community and society, costs were accrued in the following areas:

- Criminal Justice System
- Healthcare
- Social Services
- Housing & Refuge Services
- Civil Legal Costs

There were significant financial implications for society as a whole, in addition to the personal human cost of Domestic Abuse. Ms Sen argued that these human and financial costs made a compelling argument for a concerted effort from all partnerships towards support and prevention.

In conclusion, the Committee noted a slide that showed the true story of a domestic abuse survivor. It detailed the actual cost which was £63.5k, and the cost that could have been incurred with needs led intervention which was £2.3k.

A member asked how many men sought help at the One Stop Shop. It was estimated that this was roughly 5/10 out of every 300 that attended. It was estimated that the total cost of running the service was circa £800,000. The main income was rental income, and then support from LBB. It was clear that if LBB reduced its financial support, then services would be affected.

A member asked about the usage and costs of ancillary staff. It was confirmed that ancillary staff were required, and were paid out of rental income. It was noted that currently the service was running at a deficit.

Ms Sen explained that sometimes the women that came to them for help would have to give up their jobs. Those that were not working would have to make a claim for full housing benefit, or make a claim for housing benefit support to top up their wages. Grants were no longer provided.

The Chairman asked if the women coming to the service for help would have a development plan to work towards. Ms Sen responded that sometimes domestic abuse victims would need to relocate. This was easier if a safe network existed elsewhere. There was roughly a 50.50 split between those that located in and outside of the borough. Resettlement support was provided, which could also include help to get back into work and sometimes help in dealing with alcohol addiction.

Ms Sen concluded by welcoming members of the PDS committee to visit the Service.

RESOLVED that the presentation from Bromley and Croydon Women's Aid be noted.

114 MOPAC UPDATE REPORT

ES 16064

The report was presented to update the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee on the annual submission to the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC).

The Committee was briefed that 2015/16 was the third year of a four year grant from the Local Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) released by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime. The grant agreement will end in March 2017.

A condition of the MOPAC funding was that quarterly monitoring of outcomes and outputs should be collected and submitted to MOPAC, with a final end of year return. Annual dialogue meetings with MOPAC had resulted in minor amendments to the agreement.

MOPAC had agreed that the LCPF would continue in April 2017 for an additional four years funding and LBB, together with partners, were preparing a new plan which would be submitted to MOPAC at the end of 2016.

The funding allocation for LBB was:

- 2017/18 £401,731
- 2018/19 £241,699

This meant that the combined 2 year allocation was £643,430

The 2018/19 funding was indicative of the level of funding LBB could expect in 2019/20 and 2020/21. This figure included a 30% top slice for co-commissioned services, details of which would be made clear in 2017.

The Chairman stated that it was still important to achieve value for money. She referred the Committee to page 104 of the agenda papers that provided some data on the Safer Bromley Van. It was noted that in Q4, the project had only achieved 54% of its referral targets, and this represented a 23% decrease in referrals from previous quarters. The Chairman expressed concern at the decreased level of activity and the delay in employing a new locksmith.

The Committee was happy to accept the recommendations of the report.

RESOLVED that

- (1) The Portfolio Holder agree to continue the current projects in year one, subject to a review of those existing projects to ensure they continue to offer value for money and are fit for purpose.**
- (2) The Portfolio Holder agree to delegate the decision making in respect of any variations to those projects to the Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services, who will consult with the Portfolio Holder and Partners.**
- (3) The Portfolio Holder agree to receive a further report in due course to report on year two funding when further detail is available.**

115 EXPENDITURE ON CONSULTANTS 2015/16 AND 2016/17

CSD16151 and FSD16053

At its meeting on 7th September 2016, the Executive and Resources PDS Committee considered a report on expenditure on consultants across all Council departments for both revenue and capital budgets (FSD 16053). The E&R Committee requested that the report be considered by all PDS Committees.

It was recommended that the Public Protection & Safety PDS Committee considers the information about expenditure on consultants relating to the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio contained in the appendices to the attached report, and decide whether any further scrutiny was required.

The Committee noted the information provided concerning the expenditure on consultants, and felt that no further scrutiny was required.

116 WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER

CSD 16161

The Committee noted the Work Programme and the Contracts Register.

The Chairman recommended that members of the Committee attend one of the LIFE passing out parades facilitated by LFB.

The Chairman asked that Kate Frail be recontacted with a view to organising a visit to Victim Support.

The Chairman requested that members of the Committee be given the opportunity to visit BCWA and the Bromley Drug and Alcohol Advisory Service.

117 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for January 18th 2017

The Meeting ended at 9.20 pm

Chairman

Report No.
CSD 17008

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee

Date: 18th January 2017

Decision Type: Non Urgent Non Executive Non Key

Title: **MATTERS ARISING**

Contact Officer: Steve Wood, Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8313 4316 E-mail: stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Mark Bowen, Director of Corporate Services

Ward: N/A

1. Reason for report

1.1 **Appendix A** updates Members on matters arising from previous meetings.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 The Committee is asked to review progress on matters arising from previous meetings.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy/Financial/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Previous Matters Arising reports and Minutes of meetings. Previous Agenda Document.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Democratic Services
 4. Total current budget for this head: **£335,590**
 5. Source of funding: 2016/17 revenue budget
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 8 posts (7.27fte)
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Completion of "Matters Arising" Reports for PP&S PDS meetings can take up to a few hours per meeting.
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This report is intended primarily for Members of the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

<u>Minute Number/Title</u>	<u>Matters Arising</u>	<u>Update</u>
Minute 107 Matters Arising 29th November 2016	It was resolved that the Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services investigate the provision of defibrillators in selected locations.	The Executive Director will update the Committee at the meeting in January 2017.
Minute 116 Work Programme 29th November 2016	The following organisations be contacted to see if members of the Committee could visit: Victim Support, BCWA, and Bromley Drug and Alcohol Advisory Service.	Organisations have been contacted. Awaiting responses.

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
FSD17011

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Public Protection & Safety PDS Committee

Date: 18th January 2017

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: DRAFT 2017/18 BUDGET

Contact Officer: Claire Martin, Head of Finance
Tel: 020 8313 4286 E-mail: claire.martin@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment and Community Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 The prime purpose of this report is to consider the Portfolio Holder's Draft 2017/18 Budget which incorporates the full year effect of savings agreed as part of the 2016/17 Council Tax report and any further savings approved during the year which have resulted in considerable reductions in the Council's medium term "budget gap". Members are requested to consider the initial draft budget savings proposed and also identify any further action that might be taken to reduce cost pressures facing the Council over the next four years.
 - 1.2 Executive are requesting that each PDS Committee consider the proposed initial draft budget savings and cost pressures for their Portfolio and the views of each PDS Committee be reported back to the next meeting of the Executive, prior to the Executive making recommendations to Council on 2017/18 Council Tax levels.
 - 1.3 There are still outstanding issues and areas of uncertainty remaining. Any further updates will be included in the 2017/18 Council Tax report to the next meeting of the Executive.
-

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

The PDS Committee are requested to:

- (a) Consider the update on the financial forecast for 2017/18 to 2020/21;
- (b) Consider the initial draft 2017/18 Budget as a basis for setting the 2017/18 Budget;
- (c) Provide comments on the initial draft 2017/18 Budget for the February meeting of the Executive.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: The draft 2017/18 Budget reflects the Council's key priorities which includes, for example, supporting vulnerable adults with children and being ambitious for all our children and young people.
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Quality Environment
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Budgets
 4. Total current budget for this head: £2.119m
 5. Source of funding: Draft revenue budget for 2017/18
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): full details will be available with the Council's 2017/18 Financial Control Budget published in March 2017
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Statutory Requirement The statutory duties relating to financial reporting are covered within the Local Government Act 1972; the Local Government Finance Act 1998; the Local Government Act 2000; the Local Government Act 2002 and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015.
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: N/A
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The 2016/17 budget reflects the financial impact of the Council's strategies, service plans etc which impact on all of the Council's customers (including council tax payers) and users of the services.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillor comments: Council wide.

3. COMMENTARY

Approach to Budgeting, Financial Context and Economic Situation which can impact on public finances

- 3.1 Forward financial planning and financial management is a key strength at Bromley and this has been recognised previously by our external auditors. This report continues to forecast the financial prospects for the next 4 years and includes the Government's provisional core funding allocations for 2017/18 to 2019/20. At the time of writing this report, further details on various grant funding is awaited and it is important to note that some caution is required in considering any projections for 2018/19 to 2020/21.
- 3.2 The overall national debt stands at £1.7 trillion and is expected to increase to £1.9 trillion by 2019/20. The Autumn Statement 2016 identified that public sector net borrowing is expected to be £68.2bn this year which is planned to move to a deficit of £21.9bn from 2019/20 (previously planned to achieve a surplus of £10.1bn in 2019/20). The Chancellor has said that he is committed to returning public finances to balance 'as soon as practicable'. This highlights that austerity for local government is likely to continue beyond 2019/20. Departmental spending plans set out in the Spending Review 2015 remain in place. Therefore, the fiscal squeeze will continue and with ongoing protection of health, education and recently police and other security services. The disproportionate cuts in direct funding to local government will continue over the remainder of the four year spending review period. The impact of funding reductions translates to a reduction in the Council's Settlement Funding Assessment of 36% by 2019/20 compared with the England average of 21.6% for the period 2016/17 to 2019/20. An update on the economic situation which can impact on public finances is provided in Appendix 1.
- 3.3 Although there are significant funding cuts facing local government, the Chancellor repeated the aims of devolution, as part of the Autumn Statement 2016, which includes transforming local government, enabling it to be more self-sufficient. The Government views the new flexibilities such as the future growth forecasts from business rates, to be fully devolved to local government by 2020 combined with scope for an increase in council tax for the adult social care precept and the ongoing ability to increase council tax as methods which can significantly mitigate against the impact of grant reductions.
- 3.4 The Budget Strategy has to be set within the context of a reducing resource base, with Government funding reductions continuing beyond 2020 – the on-going need to reduce the size and shape of the organisation to secure priority outcomes within the resources available. There is also a need to build in flexibility in identifying options to bridge the budget gap as the gap could increase further. The overall updated strategy has to be set in the context of the national state of public finances, with austerity continuing given the level of public sector debt, and the high expectation from Government that services should be reformed and redesigned with devolution contributing to the transformation of local government. There is also an on-going need to consider "front loading" savings to ensure difficult decisions are taken early in the budgetary cycle, to provide some investment in specific priorities, to fund transformation and to support invest to save opportunities which provide a more sustainable financial position in the longer term. Any decisions will need to consider the finalisation of the 2017/18 Budget as well as the longer time frame where it is now clear that the continuation of the period of austerity remains for local government.
- 3.5 Bromley has the lowest settlement funding per head of population in the whole of London. Despite this, Bromley has retained the second lowest council tax in outer London (other low grant funded authorities tend to have higher council tax levels). This has been achieved by having one of the lowest costs per head of population in outer London. Despite being a low cost authority, Bromley has achieved general savings of over £80m since 2011/12 but it becomes more challenging to achieve further savings with a low cost base. Further details

are provided in Appendix 2.

- 3.6 One of the key issues in future year budgets will be the balance between spending, council tax levels, charges and service reductions in an organisation starting from a low spending base. It is important to recognise that a lower cost base reduces the scope to identify efficiency savings compared with a higher cost organisation.

Changes that could impact on longer term financial projections

- 3.7 The 2016/17 Council Tax report reported to Executive in February 2016 identified a significant “budget gap” over the four year financial planning period. The forecast was updated to inform the public meetings held in November 2016. Some key changes are summarised below.
- 3.8 There continues to be upward pressure on inflation and the 2017/18 Draft Budget and financial forecast assumes increased costs of 2.7% per annum for 2017/18 and 2018/19 reducing to 2.5% per annum from 2019/20. The inflation mainly relates to contract price increases. The main measure used for contract price increases is RPIX which is currently 2.5%. The Autumn Statement 2016 reported that inflation (RPI) is expected to be 3.2% in 2017, 3.5% in 2018, 3.2% in 2019 and 3.1% in 2020. A separate provision has also been reflected in the Draft 2017/18 Budget to meet the future increase in costs of the National Living Wage. Action will need to be taken by Chief Officers to fund increasing costs through alternative savings in the event that inflation exceeds the budget assumptions.
- 3.9 Following a newly elected national government, the Chancellor’s Summer Budget 2015 introduced a new national Living Wage with significant cost implications to the Council over the next few years. As previously expected in the financial forecast, the Chancellor announced, as part of his Autumn Statement 2016, further increases in the National Living Wage from 2017.
- 3.10 Despite the range of initiatives being taken to help reduce the increase in temporary accommodation pressures, the financial forecast assumes additional costs in 2017/18 of £2.25m rising to £6.0m per annum by 2020/21. The roll out of universal credit, reduction in housing benefit cap and changes to local housing allowances arising from welfare reform changes have contributed towards these increasing costs.
- 3.11 At its meeting on 18th October 2016, Executive considered the ‘Highways Investment’ report and approved capital funding for investment in planned highway maintenance to be funded by capital receipts. This will result in a reduction in the Council’s revenue budget for highways works of £2.5m per annum for the period 2017/18 to 2021/22 which will be partly offset by a reduction in treasury management income (£167k over a five year period). The funding also helps partly mitigate against future cost pressures on the highways budget. This funding was subsequently approved by full Council.
- 3.12 At its meeting on 14th September 2016, Executive considered the “Ofsted Inspection of Children’s Services” report and approved additional revenue funding of £949k in 2016/17 with a full year effect of £1,471k for Phase One and Phase Two. Funding for Phase Three of £141k in 2016/17 and £795k in the full year was also considered and any release of Phase 3 funding will be subject to a report to the Executive. The cost for Phase 3 has been included in the 2017/18 Draft Central Contingency Sum. Overall funding of £2,314k in 2017/18 and £2,266k in the full year has been included in the Draft 2017/18 Budget and the financial forecast.
- 3.13 There are further cost pressures relating to children’s social care which were reported in the ‘Budget Monitoring 2016/17’ report to Executive on 30th November 2016 and the full year effect of £2,093k has been included in the Draft 2017/18 Budget. Action is being taken by the Deputy Chief Executive & Executive Director for Education, Care and Health Services to provide a fundamental review of the placements budget which could potentially provide a corresponding

reduction of £2,093k by 2018/19. However, a prudent approach has been adopted and an equivalent sum of £2,093k will be set aside as a financial risk reserve from 2018/19, at this stage.

- 3.14 In addition, there have been overspends identified in the last 2016/17 Budget Monitoring report to Executive on 30th November 2016 relating to adult social care and SEN transport. Details were provided in the report to the Executive. The full year effect of these items is currently estimated at £2,200k. In view of the need to address the cost pressures and the uncertainty on the final financial impact, a sum of £2,200k has been included in the Draft 2017/18 Central Contingency Sum at this stage. The Deputy Chief Executive & Executive Director for Education, Care and Health Services will be seeking to establish the extent of the ongoing cost pressures and any measures to mitigate against such cost.
- 3.15 The Government previously announced additional funding for the Better Care Fund (currently combined funding with Bromley CCG of £21.6m) and the financial forecast assumes that these monies may be required to meet future new burdens on social care at this stage. The additional funding is back-loaded with lower funding available to Bromley from 2018/19 increasing to an estimated £4.6m per annum by 2019/20. This position will be reviewed prior to finalising the 2018/19 Budget. The Government announced one off funding of £1,196k for Adult Social Care as part of Local Government Finance Settlement 2017/18. The Draft 2017/18 Budget assumes that this funding is not ring-fenced. Details of the grant conditions are still awaited and this position may change once the final details are known.
- 3.16 The Spending Review and Autumn Statement 2015 included reference to Councils being allowed to have a council tax precept of up to 2% per annum to specifically fund adult social care (a 2% increase in council tax equates to £2.7m additional income per annum). Councils were able to levy the precept on top of the existing freedom to raise council tax by up to 2% without holding a referendum. Therefore, the Council could potentially have a council tax increase of just below 4% without the need for a council tax referendum. The Government introduced this change in recognition of the cost pressures facing social care authorities. As part of the Local Government Finance settlement the Government announced that the annual Social Care Precept of 2% can be applied at 3% in 2017/18 and 2018/19 subject to a maximum of 6% across the period 2017/18 to 2019/20. The financial forecast assumes an ongoing increase of the precept of 2% per annum. The Government recognise that the precept can also include, for example, funding the additional cost of the new Living Wage. Members will be requested to consider applying the precept as part of the 2017/18 Council Tax report to the Executive on 8th February 2016.
- 3.17 The additional funding for the Better Care Fund and the higher proportion of funding cuts in core grant to the Council now take into account the amount that can be raised locally through council tax and the adult social care precept. Therefore, there is an inherent assumption that local authorities will be increasing council tax and utilising the adult social care precept to mitigate against the loss of grant funding and towards meeting the cost of social care. For Bromley, this change does not take into account any need to address low funding levels for the Council raised previously with the Government. Therefore the starting point relating to funding levels remains unchanged, despite the Council's concerns. Councils can still choose locally the level of council tax increase required, subject to referendum options. In calculating the Council's spending power, the Government has assumed that social care authorities will have an average council tax increase applying both the social care precept and general council tax increases every year. For financial planning purposes, the financial forecast assumes a council tax increase of 3.99% per annum over the next four years to compensate for the higher proportion of funding reductions, to reduce the level of social care savings and provide funding to meet social care costs, demographic cost pressures and to meet the ongoing "budget gap".

- 3.18 Details of various grant allocations for 2017/18 are still awaited at the time of writing this report. These include, for example, Better Care Fund. Details of the grant conditions for the Adult Social Care Support Grant is also awaited which may impact on the 2017/18 Draft Budget.
- 3.19 Given the scale of savings identified and any inherent risks, the need for longer term financial planning, the significant changes that may follow with a new Government relating to new burdens (there were many changes introduced by the previous coalition Government that resulted in net additional costs for the Council), effect of ongoing population increases and the potential impact of other public agencies identifying savings which impact on the Council's costs, a prudent approach has been adopted in considering the Central Contingency Sum required to mitigate against these risks. If the monies are not required during the year the policy of using these resources, in general, for investment to generate income/savings and provide a more sustainable financial position should continue. To illustrate the benefit of the investment approach the Council has potential income in 2017/18 totaling £12.7m from a combination of treasury management income and rents from investment properties. Without this income, equivalent service reductions may be required. Investment in economic growth (Growth Fund) will also be key to generate additional business rate income.
- 3.20 The latest forecast indicates that despite having a balanced budget in the next two years there remains a significant budget gap in future years that will need to be addressed.

Latest Financial Forecast

- 3.21 The report to Executive in January 2017 identified a budget gap rising to over £23.6m by 2020/21 which is broken down in the table below. The gap rises steeply from 2019/20: -

Variations Compared with 2016/17 Budget

	2017/18 £m	2018/19 £m	2019/20 £m	2020/21 £m
Cost Pressures				
Inflation	4.6	9.9	15.2	20.7
Grant Loss (net of Adult Social Care Support Grant)	8.8	18.4	24.7	29.4
Potential Impact of Chancellor's 2015 Summer Budget on Future Costs (eg. welfare reforms and new living wage)	0.7	4.5	7.7	8.5
Review of Children's Services following Ofsted Report	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Children's Placements - full year effect of 2016/17 overspend	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1
Review of Children's Placements	0.0	-2.1	-2.1	-2.1
Provision for Cost Pressures - Children's Social Care	0.0	2.1	2.1	2.1
Full Year Effect of Additional Costs re. Adult Social Care and Education SEN	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2
Impact of Reduction in Bank Base Rate	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
Commissioning Programme (one-off funding)	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Real Changes (see Appendix 5)	-0.1	1.3	1.3	2.1
Total Additional Costs	21.7	41.3	56.1	67.9
Income / Savings				
Full Year Effect of Savings Agreed as part of 2016/17 Budget	-3.3	-4.2	-4.3	-4.3
Impact of Highways Investment Report	-2.5	-2.5	-2.5	-2.5
Acquisition of Residential Properties to Accommodate Homeless and "Gifting" of Scheme to Pension Fund	-2.2	-3.7	-4.1	-4.1
Reduction in Council's Central Contingency Sum	-0.7	-2.4	-2.5	-2.5
Additional Income from Business Rate Share	-0.3	-0.6	-0.9	-1.2
Additional Income Opportunity (TFM Contract)	0.0	-0.5	-0.7	-0.9
Total Income / Savings	-9.0	-13.9	-15.0	-15.5
Other Proposed Changes				
New Homes Bonus - Support for Revenue Budget	-6.0	-3.2	-2.5	-1.0
New Homes Bonus - Reallocation	2.2	-2.2	0.0	0.0
Impact of Pension Fund Triennial Valuation (Provisional)	-1.5	-1.5	-1.5	-1.5
Collection Fund Surplus 2014/15 and 2015/16 (set aside to meet funding shortfall in future years)	0.0	-6.9	-4.4	0.0
Total Other Proposed Changes	-5.3	-13.8	-8.4	-2.5
Council Tax				
Increase in Council Tax Base to reflect additional properties and increased collection rates	-2.0	-2.7	-3.3	-4.0
Impact of 3.99% Increase in Council Tax (including Adult Social Care Precept)	-5.4	-10.9	-16.6	-22.3
Total Council Tax	-7.4	-13.6	-19.9	-26.3
Remaining "Budget Gap"	0.0	0.0	12.8	23.6

The above table shows, for illustrative purposes the impact of a council tax increase of 3.99% in 2017/18 (including adult social care precept). Each 1% council tax increase generates on-going annual income of £1.4m.

- 3.22 The table shows that the Council, on a roll forward basis, has a “structural deficit” as the on-going budget has increasing costs relating to inflation and service pressures as well as the on-going loss of Government grants. These changes are not being funded by a corresponding growth in income. The above projection includes savings previously agreed to reduce the “budget gap”.
- 3.23 Although it has been possible to achieve a potential balanced budget for the next two years through a combination of front loading savings in previous years, proactively generating investment income and prudent financial management, there remains a “budget gap” of £12.8m in 2019/20 rising to £23.6m in 2020/21. The projections in later years have to be treated with some caution.
- 3.24 The Council has to continue to plan for a very different future, i.e. several years of strong financial restraint. It is important to recognise that, given the current ongoing period of austerity for local government, the downside risks remain significant and that the budget gap in future years could widen substantially.
- 3.25 In considering action required to address the medium term “budget gap”, the Council has taken significant action to reduce the cost base while protecting priority front line services and providing sustainable longer term solutions. Significant savings were identified as part of the 2016/17 budget (£15.7m in 2016/17 rising to £20.0m by 2019/20) and the full year effect of these savings is reflected in the table at para. 3.8.

Growth Pressures & Real Changes

- 3.26 There are no growth pressures included in the four year forecast for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.

Saving Options

- 3.27 There are no new savings options relating to the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio. Appendix 1 includes the draft estimate summary sheet, budget variations (including the full year effect of saving options agreed for 2016/17), notes on the budget variations and the subjective analysis.

4. IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN

- 4.1 The draft 2017/18 Budget reflects the Council’s key priorities which includes, for example, supporting vulnerable adults with children and being ambitious for all our children and young people.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Council launched the updated “Building a Better Bromley 2016-2018” and the budget proposals reflect the Council’s priorities. “Building a Better Bromley 2016-2018” identifies key priorities as follows

- Ensure financial independence and sustainability;
- Invest in our business and our people
- Ambitious for all our children and young people
- Enhance our clean and green Borough.

5.2 Ensure financial independence and sustainability priorities include:

- Strict management of our budgets to ensure we live within our means
- Working to achieve the benefits of the integration of health and social care
- Early intervention for our vulnerable residents

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The financial implications are contained within the overall report.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Staff, departmental and trade union representatives will be consulted individually and collectively on any adverse staffing implications arising from the Draft 2017/18 Budget. Managers have also been asked to encourage and facilitate staff involvement in budget and service planning.

8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The adoption of the budget and the setting of the council tax are matters reserved for the Council upon recommendation from the Executive. The Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) requires the Council to set an amount of Council tax for each financial year and provides that it must be set before 11th March in the financial year preceding that for which it is set. Sections 73-79 of the Localism Act 2011 amended the calculations, billing and precepting authorities need to make in determining the basic amount of Council tax. The changes included new sections 31 A and 31 B to the Local Government Finance Act 1992 which has modified the way in which a billing authority calculates its budget requirement and basic amount of Council Tax.

8.2 Schedule 5 to the Localism Act 2011 inserted a new section 52ZB in the 1992 Act which sets out the duty on billing authorities, and precepting authorities to each determine whether their relevant basic amount of council tax for a financial year is excessive. If an authority's relevant basic amount of council tax is excessive, the provisions in relation to the duty to hold a referendum will apply.

8.3 The Education Act 2005 introduced the concept of a funding period, which allows for the introduction of multiple year budgets rather than the setting of financial year budgets.

8.4 Executive is being requested to delegate the setting of the schools budget funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant to the Education Portfolio Holder.

8.5 The making of these budget decisions at full Council is a statutory responsibility for all Members. Members should also have regard to the changes from the Localism Act relating to council tax increases and the recent introduction of the Adult Social Care precept. The Council has a number of statutory duties which it must fulfil by law – although there can be an element of discretion on level of service provision. The Council also discharges a range of discretionary services. The Council is not bound to carry out such activities in the same way as it is for statutory duties – although it may be bound contractually to do so. A decision to cease or reduce provision of a discretionary service must be taken in accordance with sound public /administrative law decision making principles. The Council must also comply with the Public sector Equality Duties in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In doing so, the Council must have due regard to elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimization, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations with persons who share a protected characteristic.

- 8.6 The Local Government Act 2003 included new requirements to be followed by local authorities, which includes the CIPFA Prudential Code. This includes obligations, which includes ensuring adequacy of future years reserves in making budget decisions and section 25 of that act requires the Director of Finance to report on the robustness of the estimates made for the purposes of calculating the Council Tax and the adequacy of the reserves. Further details to support these obligations will be reflected in the 2017/18 Council Tax report to be reported to the February meeting of the Executive.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Procurement implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Finance Monitoring, Estimate Documents etc all held in Finance Section

PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO**DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2017/18 - SUMMARY**

2015/16 Actual £	Service Area	2016/17 Budget £	Increased costs £	Other Changes £	2017/18 Draft Budget £
	Public Protection				
172,302	Community Safety	126,100	1,640	Cr 1,400	126,340
70,075	Emergency Planning	78,110	1,090	0	79,200
332,871	Mortuary & Coroners Service	355,080	7,890	40,000	402,970
1,464,426	Public Protection	1,389,010	30,240	Cr 90,290	1,328,960
2,039,674		1,948,300	40,860	Cr 51,690	1,937,470
2,039,674	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE	1,948,300	40,860	Cr 51,690	1,937,470
425,884	TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE	6,230	120	Cr 3,080	3,270
28,874	TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES	158,970	0	19,430	178,400
2,494,432	PORTFOLIO TOTAL	2,113,500	40,980	Cr 35,340	2,119,140

SUMMARY OF BUDGET VARIATIONS 2017/18

Ref		VARIATION IN 2017/18 £'000	ORIGINAL BUDGET 2016/17 £'000
1	2016/17 BUDGET	2,113	
2	Increased Costs	41	
	Movements Between Portfolios/Departments		
3	Transfer of resources for asbestos testing work	<u>Cr 36</u> Cr 36	36
	Real Changes		
	<i>Savings identified for 2017/18 as part of the 2016/17 Budget process</i>		
4	Car Allowance Savings	<u>Cr 15</u> Cr 15	50
	<i>Real Changes Funded by Savings</i>		
5	Coroners Service	40	
6	Savings from award of new kennelling contract	<u>Cr 40</u>	0
7	Variations in Recharges	19	
8	Variations in Insurances	Cr 3	
9	2017/18 DRAFT BUDGET	<u><u>2,119</u></u>	

PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PORTFOLIO**Notes on Budget Variations in 2017/18****Ref Comments****Movements Between Portfolios/Departments**

- 3 Transfer of resources for asbestos testing work (Cr £36k)
A sum of £36k has been transferred to operational property for carrying out asbestos testing work. This was subsequently passed to Amey as part of the TFM contract.

Real Changes

- 4 Car Allowance Savings (Cr £15)
This reflects the full year effect of the car allowance savings.
- 5 Coroners Service (Dr £40k)
The LB Croydon have notified the other three Boroughs in the Consortium that there will be an increase in costs of the service. These costs cover the Coroner's salary, post mortems, forensic toxicology, inquests and other related running costs.
- 6 Savings from award of new kennelling contract (Cr £40k)
Savings of £40k have been achieved from a combination of an award of a new kennelling contract and due to a reduction in the number of dogs required to be kept in kennels.
- 7 Variations in Recharges (Dr £19k)
Variations in cross-departmental recharges are offset by corresponding variations elsewhere and therefore have no impact on the overall position.
- 8 Variations in Insurance (Cr £3k)
Insurance recharges to individual portfolios have changed between years, in some cases significantly, partly because we have factored in an extra year of claims experience since the 2016/17 budget was finalised. Despite the increase in Insurance Premium Tax from 9.5% to 10% which takes effect from February 2017, as well as the take-up of Terrorism cover for the first time, the overall variation across the Council is Cr £1k as a result of the savings achieved by tendering the insurance policies with effect from August 2016.

PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PORTFOLIO
DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2017/18 - SUBJECTIVE SUMMARY

Service area	Employees	Premises	Transport	Supplies and Services	Third Party Payments	Income	Controllable Recharges	Total Controllable	Repairs, Maintenance & Insurance	Not Directly Controllable	Recharges In	Total Cost of Service	Recharges Out	Total Net Budget
	£	£	£	£	£	£		£			£	£	£	£
Public Protection														
Community Safety	191,750	0	5,710	16,700	0	Cr 403,550	315,730	126,340	240	240	539,940	666,520	Cr 43,270	623,250
Emergency Planning	51,360	0	5,440	22,400	0	0	0	79,200	70	70	43,660	122,930	0	122,930
Mortuary & Coroners Service	0	0	0	0	402,970	0	0	402,970	0	0	21,990	424,960	0	424,960
Public Protection	1,860,660	41,740	52,150	159,300	538,300	Cr 380,670	Cr 942,520	1,328,960	2,960	2,960	910,050	2,241,970	Cr 1,293,970	948,000
	2,103,770	41,740	63,300	198,400	941,270	Cr 784,220	Cr 626,790	1,937,470	3,270	3,270	1,515,640	3,456,380	Cr 1,337,240	2,119,140

Report No.
ES17006

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder

For Pre-decision scrutiny by the Public Protection & Safety PDS Committee on

Date: Wednesday 18 January 2017

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Key

Title: EXTENSION OF DOG AND PEST CONTROL CONTRACTS

Contact Officer: Jim McGowan, Head of Environmental Protection
Tel: 020 8313 4651 E-mail: Jim.McGowan@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 Following the report presented to the Public Protection & Safety Committee on September 28th 2016 the Portfolio Holder agreed to re-tender the Stray and Abandoned Dogs service and pest control service contracts.
 - 1.2 The final extension on Bromley's contracts for the Stray and Abandoned Dogs and Pest Control services expires on 30 April 2017 and unfortunately the procurement process for these contracts will not be completed in time for the new contracts to start on the 1 May 2017.
 - 1.3 This report therefore recommends that the current contracts are extended.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety is recommended to:

2.1 Agree to the 'extension' of:

- The Dog Warden service from 1.05.2017 to 31.01.2018;
- Kennelling services from 1.05.2017 to 31.01.2018
- Rehoming service from 1.05.2017 to 31.01.2018 and,

The 'extensions' are to provide the necessary time for the Council to complete the European tender procurement process.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: no substantive impact on vulnerable adults and children
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Healthy Bromley:
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Within existing Policy
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Safer Bromley
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: £79k in total (detail is included in the financial section)
 2. Ongoing costs: £79k for 9 months
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Dog & Pest control contract (PPS) and Parks
 4. Total current budget for this head: £120k and £4k
 5. Source of funding: Existing revenue funding 2017/18
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 0.1 FTE
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement for Dog Warden and Dog Kennelling services
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of potential users/beneficiaries (current and projected): 310,000
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Not applicable

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The council's statutory duties and current service arrangements are set out in detail in Appendix 1 and a summary of the current contract arrangements for the Stray Dogs and Pest Control contracts are:

Service	Name of provider	Annual Contract Value	Contract expiry date
Dog Warden	SDK Environmental Ltd.	£63,600	30 April 2017
Kennelling	Lodge Kennels	£24,000 (estimated)	30 April 2017
Rehoming	Battersea Cats and Dogs Home	£5,000 (estimated)	30 April 2017
Pest Control	SDK Environmental Ltd.	£12,000	30 April 2017

- 3.2 The Pest control contract is a preferred contractor scheme and a cost of £ 8k pa. is incurred by the Council on this contract for the two Traveller sites at Star Lane and Old Maidstone Rd. In addition to the regular baiting activity there is irregular pest control services carried out due to infestations of vermin or insects at these sites. The average annual cost of these treatments over the last five years is £4k. The council also receives regular monitoring bait points at nil cost in approximately 100 locations in the borough. The estimated value of the service to LBB is £12-15k per annum.
- 3.3 Due to the uncertainty of the future commissioning arrangements of the Public Protection Division, the decision to move ahead with the procurement of the Stray Dogs and Pest Control contracts was delayed. On 28 September 2016 at the Public Protection & Safety and Committee (Reference ES16043), Members considered the appropriate way forward for the Stray dogs and pest control contracts and the Portfolio Holder agreed that that they should be put out to competitive tender.
- 3.4 Due to the value of the contracts, Procurement officers have advised that this will be a European tender and as such the normal timescale for the European tender process (OJEU) is approximately 12 months from the date of authorisation to the contract award
- 3.5 Whilst the process for Procurement started soon after the Portfolio Holder's decision in September 2016 and the four specifications for stray and abandoned dog warden service, kennelling service, rehoming and pest control services have now been drawn up, ready for the tender process there is unfortunately insufficient time to run an OJEU process for the new contracts to commence by 1 April 2017. Advice from procurement is that the process is likely to be completed by the end of 2017 and that an extension has to be sought to the existing contractual arrangements, as summarised in paragraph 1.2.
- 3.6 In order to comply with Financial Regulations, it is necessary to extend the existing contracts by a sufficient amount of time to allow compliance with the OJEU timescales and this Report seeks authorisation to extend the contracts to 31st January 2018. The contractor(s) should then be appointed on February 1st 2018.

4. IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN

- 4.1 The provision of the service for pest control within the Borough is currently subsidised by the contractor for vulnerable local residents, where they are in receipt of benefits and unable to pay the full fee and able to arrange treatment. Removing this subsidy could have a detrimental effect on vulnerable adults and the knock on effect could impact further on

Bromley residents.

- 4.2 If rats, in particular, are left uncontrolled then their population will reproduce and multiply and it will impact on the local and wider Bromley Community.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 This report is in line with the current Portfolio Plan for Public Protection and both the Quality Environment and Excellent Council elements of the Building a Better Bromley Plan.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The table below shows the total cumulative spend with each contractor should the 'extension' be agreed: -

	SDK Env Ltd £'000	SDK Env Ltd Pest Control £'000	Total SDK £'000	The Lodge Kennels £'000	Battersea Dog & Cats Home £'000
Historical spend prior to 1.12.12 *	532.1	0.0	532.1	0.0	0.0
Cumulative spend from 1.12.12 to date 20.12.16 **	254.3	45.5	299.8	14.7	0.8
Estimated spend to end contract 30.4.17	26.5	5.0	31.5	9.2	4.6
Value of 'extension' to 31st January 2018	48.0	9.0	57.0	18.0	3.7
Total cumulative spend	860.9	59.5	920.4	41.9	9.1

* The cumulative spend for SDK includes some previous Kennelling and Pest Control contract costs under the original contracts.

** The value of the 'extension' for SDK Pest Control includes a small element of pest control for travellers sites, and parks for one-off infestations.

The contracts for the Lodge and Battersea started in February 2016.

It should be noted that the spend position from 1.3.15 to 30.4.17 for SDK Ltd is £162k.

- 6.2 In addition to the 'paid for' services above, SDK carry out regular baiting monitoring at over 100 sites within the Borough at nil cost. The estimated value of this service is £12k - £15k per annum.
- 6.3 The annual budget for these contracts is £124k, £4k of which is contained in the parks budget within the Environment Portfolio.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The dog collection and kennelling service is currently contracted out, with minimal administrative and managerial responsibilities remaining as the responsibility of the London Borough of Bromley. Contract monitoring will be arranged in house. Existing staff that carry out these services may TUPE from the incumbent to any successful contractor.
- 7.2 The pest control treatment services are currently contracted out, with minimal administrative and managerial responsibilities remaining with the Council. However there is the need for a level of staffing to remain to deal with the enforcement of pest control matters.

7.3 Existing staff that carry out these services under the two contracts may, under TUPE be eligible to transfer from the incumbent to any successful contractor.

8 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 This report seeks the approval of the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee to extend a contract for the provision of services relating to pest control and stray dogs, namely, a dog warden service, kennelling and a rehoming service. The contracts are to be extended over the periods stated in the recommendation.

8.2 There are existing contracts for the services which were entered into many years ago and extensions of time are required whilst a new procurement for the services takes place. The new procurement has been approved and the timetable for the new procurement is set out in a background paper to this report.

8.3 A small extension of time is required for each contract but these modifications are not considered substantial and therefore fall within the meaning of regulation 72(1) (e) and 72 (8) of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

8.4 Rule 23 of the Contract Procedure Rules provides that Chief Officers may approve variations to contracts where the value of the variation does not exceed £50,000.

8.5 Under sections 149 -151 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Clean Neighbourhoods & Environment Act 2005 the Local Authority has a statutory responsibility to provide a 24/7 dog collection service and kennelling service for confined dogs.

8.6 The report author will need to consult with the Legal Department regarding the execution of the variation to the contract.

9. PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Given that the indicated spend, since the introduction of the New Public Contract Regulations at the end of February 2015, is less than the value at which we would need to tender in line with their requirements and given that the intention is to regularise the contractual position at the end of the extension period. The actions proposed represent the best course of action to secure value for money at this time and allow for the future contract to be placed in line with the required legislation at the end of the extension period.

Non-Applicable Sections:	[List non-applicable sections here]
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	ES16043 September 28 th 2016 ES15031 and ES15033 April 8 th 2016

Appendix 1

Stray and Abandoned Dogs

3.1 The Council has a statutory requirement to provide a 24/7 service for the collection and kennelling of stray and abandoned dogs.

3.2 The statutory service includes:

Dog Warden service

- A dog collection service for confined dogs on a 24 /7 basis in compliance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990, subject to the Clean Neighbourhoods & Environment Act Section 68.
- The delivery of seized dogs to the Council nominated kennel during their opening hours and temporary holding and care of dogs at the contractor's holding unit at times when the nominated kennel is closed.

Dog Kennelling

- To receive stray dogs collected by the Bromley appointed contractor and to undertake the safe custody and care of said animals until release or destruction (for banned or dangerous breeds) is authorised by the Council Authorised Officer.

Delivery of Veterinary care on the basis required.

Re-homing service

3.3 The London Borough Bromley has a non-destruction policy for healthy and safe dogs (that are not classified as a banned breed or dangerous) and therefore has a requirement to re-home dogs that are not claimed by their owners. The requirements for the re-homing service are as follows:

- On the eighth day of confinement in the Council's nominated kennel, preparations are made for the dog warden contractor to transfer the dog to the nominated kennels for re-homing.

3.4 All relevant statutory and non-statutory guidance and good practice relating to the welfare of dogs are to be followed. The services are currently delivered by three contractors:

Dog Warden service - SDK Environmental Ltd (SDK),
Kennelling services - Lodge Kennels, Bromley.

Re-homing service - Battersea Dogs and Cats Home

Pest Control Services

- 3.5 Although there is no specific statutory requirement for the Council to provide a pest control treatment service to the public, there are specific statutory obligations under Part I of the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949 in relation to the Council having to keep its district clear of rats and mice. The Council is required to keep its own land free of rodents and to respond to complaints of vermin in its district. There is also a statutory obligation to deal with insect infestation under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Public Health Act 1936.
- 3.6 As part of the existing contract regular pest control is delivered at a number of LBB sites within the borough:
- Star Lane and Old Maidstone Road Travellers Sites – monthly baiting activity at a cost of £8k per annum
 - Permanent monitoring bait points at suitable locations within Bromley Parks and the Depot premises; there are approximately 100 permanent monitoring bait points within these areas. This is carried out at nil cost to the Council as negotiated added value within the current contract. The estimated notional value of this service is £12-15k per annum.
- 3.7 In addition to the regular baiting activity there is irregular pest control services carried out due to infestations of vermin or insects at these sites. The average annual cost of these treatments over the last five years is £4k
- 3.8 The current contract also includes a concession arrangement, where officers refer residents to the preferred contractor and they deal with all aspects of providing the services. Residents and businesses requiring pest control services are charged by the contractor at a rate in accordance with the prices agreed via the tender process.

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ES17001

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder

**For Pre-decision scrutiny by the Public Protection & Safety
PDS Committee on**

Date: Wednesday 18th January 2017

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: ANIMAL WELFARE - LICENCE FEES FOR HOME BOARDERS

Contact Officer: Paul Lehane, Head of Food Safety, Occupational Safety and Licensing
Tel: 020 8313 4216 E-mail: Paul.Lehane@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

To propose a new licence fee for Home Boarding of cats and dogs in light of the reduced veterinary inspection costs.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The Portfolio Holder is asked to:

Agree the new licence fee of £146 for Home Boarding of cats and dogs under the Animal Boarding Establishments Act 1963 with effect 1st January 2017.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: Not Applicable
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Not Applicable
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Quality Environment Safer Bromley:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Net nil
 2. Ongoing costs: N/A
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Budget
 4. Total current budget for this head: £1.9m
 5. Source of funding: Existing Revenue Budget 2016/2017
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 5.6fte (Licensing)
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: The Council is the licensing authority for Animal Boarding Establishments
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: The City of London Veterinary service is appointed to undertake the inspection of animal boarding establishments
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): 8
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The Council issues licences under the Animal Boarding Establishments Act 1963 for cats and dogs to be boarded in catterys and kennels. Licences run from 1st January to 31 December each year.
- 3.2 The Act requires applicants to pay a fee determined by the Council. General legal principles of licensing law allow the council to fully recover the costs of a licensing scheme but not to make profit.
- 3.3 The current fees are based on a charge for the Councils appointed veterinary surgeon (£211), and an admin fee of £4.22 per cat or dog.
- 3.4 In recent years there has been a trend in people undertaking home boarding of cats and dogs. This involves looking after a small number of animals (maximum of 5 including the owner's own pets) in a domestic setting where the animals are looked after more as a family pet than in a traditional cattery or kennel.
- 3.5 This has prompted questions about the equity of the fees charged when compared to those of a larger kennel or cattery.
- 3.6 In recognition of this change the City of London Veterinary Service who we use to inspect premises has revised its fee structure to reflect the reduced time required to undertake this type of inspection. They are proposing a new fee of £74 with effect from 1 January 2016.
- 3.7 We propose to replace the administration fee based on the number of animals to a single charge of £72. This covers all aspects of the administration of the scheme (grant and renewal of licences and any visits required in connection with complaints etc.
- 3.8 The proposed fee for home boarders from 1 January 2017 is £146.
- 3.9 We currently licence 26 premises as animal boarding establishments, 8 of which would be classified as being Home Boarders and would attract the reduced fee.
- 3.10 If members agreed to this there will be a small overall reduction in the income from animal boarding establishments of approx. £700, however this will be offset by a reduction in Veterinary costs.
- 3.11 All non-statutory fees are reviewed annually in spring to ensure they are appropriate and these fees will be included in that review.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The proposal will reduce the overall annual income from the licensing of animal boarding establishments by approximately £700. The reduction in veterinary costs will offset this loss of income.
- 4.2 It should be noted that the revised price fully recovers the costs incurred.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Council is the licensing authority for the Animal Boarding Establishments Act 1963. Under the Act an applicant must pay a fee set by the Council. The Council can recover its costs through the licence fee but cannot make a profit.

6. PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The City of London Veterinary service is appointed to undertake the inspection of animal boarding establishments

Non-Applicable Sections:	IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS POLICY IMPLICATIONS
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Animal Boarding Establishments Act 1963

Report No.
FSD17009

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO HOLDER

Date: For pre-decision scrutiny by the Public Protection & Safety PDS Committee on 18th January 2017

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 2ND QUARTER 2016/17

Contact Officer: James Mullender, Principal Accountant
Tel: 020 8313 4292 E-mail: james.mullender@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director of Finance

Ward: All Wards

1. Reason for report

On 30th November 2016, Executive received the 2nd quarterly capital monitoring report for 2016/17 and agreed a revised Capital Programme for the four year period 2016/17 to 2019/20. This report highlights changes agreed by Executive in respect of the Capital Programme for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio. The revised programme for this portfolio and detailed comments on scheme progress as at the end of the 2nd quarter of 2016/17 are shown in Appendix A.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The Portfolio Holder is asked to note and confirm the changes agreed by the Executive on 30th November 2016.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Capital Programme monitoring is part of the planning and review process for all services. Capital schemes help to maintain and improve the quality of life in the borough. Effective asset management planning (AMP) is a crucial corporate activity if a local authority is to achieve its corporate and service aims and objectives and deliver its services. For each of our portfolios and service priorities, we review our main aims and outcomes through the AMP process and identify those that require the use of capital assets. Our primary concern is to ensure that capital investment provides value for money and matches the Council's overall priorities as set out in the Community Plan and in "Building a Better Bromley".
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Nil net effect.
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Capital Programme
 4. Total current budget for this head: £99k for the PP&S Portfolio over four years 2016/17 to 2019/20
 5. Source of funding: Capital grants, capital receipts and earmarked revenue contributions
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1 fte
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 36 hours per week
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? N/A
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

Capital Monitoring – variations agreed by the Executive on 30th November 2016

- 3.1 A revised Capital Programme was approved by the Executive in November 2016, following a detailed monitoring exercise carried out after the 2nd quarter of 2016. The base position is the programme approved by the Executive on 20th July 2016, as amended by variations approved at subsequent Executive meetings. There were no changes to the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio this quarter. The revised Programme for the Portfolio, actual spend against budget in the second quarter of 2016/17, together with detailed comments on individual schemes are all shown in Appendix A.

Post-Completion Reports

- 3.2 Under approved Capital Programme procedures, capital schemes should be subject to a post-completion review within one year of completion. These reviews should compare actual expenditure against budget and evaluate the achievement of the scheme's non-financial objectives. No post-completion reports are currently due for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio, but this quarterly report will monitor the future position and will highlight any further reports required.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Capital Programme monitoring and review is part of the planning and review process for all services.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 These were reported in full to Executive on 30th November 2016. Changes agreed by the Executive for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Capital Programme are set out in paragraph 3.1.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal, Personnel & Procurement Implications, Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Approved Capital Programme (Executive 20/07/16) Q2 monitoring report (Executive 30/11/16)

This page is left intentionally blank

Table A - Revised Capital Programme

PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO - APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME 30th Nov 2016								
Code	Capital Scheme/Project	Total Approved Estimate	Actual to 31.03.16	Estimate 2016/17	Estimate 2017/18	Estimate 2018/19	Estimate 2019/20	Responsible Officer
		£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	
939446	CCTV Control room - refurbishment	340	241	99	0	0	0	Jim McGowan
TOTAL PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO		340	241	99	0	0	0	

Table B - Scheme progress at Q2 2016/17

PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO - QUARTER 2 2016/17					
Code	Capital Scheme/Project	Approved Estimate Jul 2016	Revised Estimate Nov 2016	Actual to 22.12.16	Responsible Officer Comments
		£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	
939446	CCTV Control room - refurbishment	99	99	0	There were minor delays due to slight changes on the specification. One of the lower cost options was adopted by Parking, and Vemotion costs were slightly lower than expected. The Parking scheme has not yet received authorisation from the Secretary of State for the TCF (Technical Content File), and the system will not go live until it has been agreed. Officers are not prepared to complete and accept hand over until problems have been rectified. 90%+ of project is now complete; once all the outstanding works have been completed, the residual balance will be removed from the programme.
TOTAL PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO		99	99	0	

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ES17007

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE

Date: Wednesday 18 January 2017

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: REVIEW OF THE EMERGENCY PLANNING & BUSINESS CONTINUITY SERVICE

Contact Officer: Paul Lehane Head of Food, Safety & Licensing paul.lehane@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

This report forms part of the planned review of services overseen by the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder and PDS Committee.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

Members are asked to

2.1 Note and comment on the report

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Not Applicable
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Quality Environment Safer Bromley Supporting Children and Young People, Healthy Bromley:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: N/A
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost: N/A
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Emergency Planning
 4. Total current budget for this head: £78.1k
 5. Source of funding: Existing Controllable Budget 2016/2017
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1 fte
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement. The Council is a Category 1 responder under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All Residents and business in the Borough.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

3.1 The Council is a Category 1 responder along with the police, fire and ambulance services in the event of an 'emergency or major incident'. As such the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 imposes a range of duties on us.

3.2 Category 2 responders are cooperating bodies such as transport and utility companies. These organisations are less likely to be involved in the heart of planning work but will be heavily involved in incidents that affect their own sector.

3.3 What is an Emergency ?

An "Emergency" is defined in Part 1 of the Act as:

An event or situation which threatens serious damage to

- Human welfare in a place in the UK,
- The environment of a place in the UK,
- War or terrorism which threatens serious damage to the security of the UK.

3.4 What is Emergency Planning?

Emergency Planning aims to provide robust contingencies and up to date plans to control or mitigate the effects of an emergency.

The Cabinet Office publishes 'Emergency Preparedness' guidance which we use locally to shape our service.

Bromley's key responsibilities include

- Assessing the risk of emergencies occurring and using this to inform contingency planning and to produce and maintain the Borough Risk Register with our Partners.
- Establishing and maintaining emergency plans
- Having robust business continuity arrangements to ensure that the Council can continue to provide services during emergencies whether internally or community wide.
- Establishing arrangements to make information available to the public about civil protection matters and maintain arrangements to warn, inform and advise the public in the event of an emergency
- Co-operating and sharing information with other local responders to enhance co-ordination
- Providing advice and assistance to businesses and voluntary organisations about business continuity management.
- Agreeing to be part of the gold arrangements for London and supporting the aims of London wide Preparedness

3.5 Plans focus on at least 3 key groupings of people –

- The Vulnerable,

Vulnerable people may be less able to help themselves in an emergency than self-reliant people. Those who are considered to be vulnerable will vary depending on the nature of the emergency, but plans should consider: those with health needs, mobility difficulties (those with physical disabilities or pregnant women); those with mental health difficulties; and others who are dependent, such as children.

- Victims (including survivors, family and friends)

Victims of an emergency include not only those directly affected but also those who, as family and friends, suffer bereavement or the anxiety of not knowing what has happened.

- Our Staff.

Plans sometimes place unrealistic expectations on management and staff, especially when the event is protracted. Our plans need to give consideration to staff welfare. For example introducing rotas/handovers, ensuring staff have breaks and that we are conscious of stress when working under pressure during an emergency.

3.6 Bromley's plans cover

- **Reducing, controlling or mitigating the effects of an emergency**

The main bulk of our planning focuses how we minimise the effects of an emergency. As obvious as it sounds, emergency plans should include procedures for determining whether an emergency has occurred, and when to activate the plan in response to an emergency. This should include identifying an appropriately trained person who will take the decision, in consultation with others, on when an emergency has occurred.

- **Taking other action in connection with an emergency**

We also plan to deal with the secondary impacts of an emergency such as the public and media reaction.

- 3.7 Once a plan has been prepared, it must be maintained systematically to ensure it remains up-to-date and fit for purpose at any time if an emergency occurs. It should also be disseminated to those who have direct responsibility for its activation and to ensure that adequate training and regular exercising of the plans are carried out. Lessons learnt from exercises are key to improving the procedures for the future. This ensures plans remain relevant and staff are confident in how to respond should an emergency occur.
- 3.8 Multiple organisations can develop a joint emergency plan where the partners agree that, for a successful combined response, they need a formal set of procedures governing them all. For example, in the event that evacuation is required, the police would need carefully pre-planned co-operation from various other organisations such as fire and ambulance services and the local authority, as well as involvement of others such as transport organisations. Examples of our joint plans include flooding, excess deaths and pandemic flu.

London wide arrangements for Emergency Planning

- 3.9 As a London Borough we have certain responsibilities to provide support to London as a whole should a Pan London response be required.
- 3.10 The Councils local arrangements support and compliment the Pan London Emergency planning arrangements which are led by the Mayor of London through the London Resilience Partnership. The day to day planning and coordination is undertaken by the London Fire Brigade Emergency Planning Team (now called the London Resilience Team) who provide central strategic coordination as well as an operational response to emergencies. They have an Emergency Control Centre in Merton which provides a single point of contact and coordination for London. A London Council Chief Executive is always on call to support a coordinated Local

Authority response via the London Local Authorities Gold arrangements (LLAG) and has authority to act on behalf of all the London Boroughs.

- 3.11 The London Resilience Forum ensures London's preparedness in the event of emergencies and coordinates the activities of a wide range of organisations to achieve this. It also provides a link between emergency preparedness and resilience at the local and national levels. More than 170 organisations make up the London Resilience Partnership.
- 3.12 London is subdivided into 6 Sub Regional Resilience Forums (SRRF). We are part of the South East SRRF covering Bexley, Croydon, Greenwich and Lewisham.
- 3.13 As well as the London Resilience Forum, each local authority is required to have a Borough Resilience Forum. These local arrangements enable local cooperation and information sharing.
- 3.14 In the event of an emergency the Metropolitan Police chair the Strategic Coordinating Group (SCG) this is a Multi-agency body responsible for co-ordinating the joint response to an emergency.
- 3.15 As part of the continued commitment to consistency and accountability the London Resilience Forum sets a minimum level of service and preparedness that each borough aspires to meet. This is subject to a 3 year cycle lead by the London Resilience Team with an in depth audit of 8 plans each year.
- 3.16 The LFB London Resilience Team arranges various events for the whole of London to train and exercise plans. In February 2016 London hosted Exercise Unified Response one of the largest emergency planning exercise events ever staged.

Emergency Planning in Bromley

- 3.17 The Emergency Planning function sits within the Public Protection Division of E&CS. We have 1 full time EP Manager (Laurie Grasty) who is managed by Paul Lehane who reports to Dan Jones Assistant Director SS&GS and PP. Laurie Grasty manages a virtual team of responders who are all volunteers from within the Council. Currently these number about 70 people.
- 3.18 It is important to appreciate that the Emergency Planning Manager does not provide the emergency response on behalf of the Council but seeks to ensure the Council is prepared and provides coordination of services through other departments and our contractors. The Emergency Planning Manager facilitates the response.
- 3.19 Within the Council there is a strategic hierarchy of control in the event of an incident.
 - **GOLD** (Strategic) The Chief Executive or in his absence the Executive Director of Environmental Services
 - **SILVER** (Tactical) The Borough Emergency Control Centre Manager
 - **BRONZE** (Operation) the Local Authority Liaison Officer (LALO) / Rest Centre Managers.

Borough Emergency Control Centre (BECC)

- 3.20 In the event of an emergency the Council can establish a Borough Emergency Control Centre (BECC) at the Civic Centre from which to coordinate the response. The Control Centre is supported by key staff representing each of the Councils Directorates with admin support to coordinate information, map the incident and log all the decisions.

- 3.21 The BECC is managed by one or more of six trained volunteers. These officers also provide a 24 hour on call service to implement the Councils overarching Emergency Plan and establish the BECC. They also decide whether to deploy the Local Authority Liaison Officers (LAOL's) or to establish Rest Centres if people have been evacuated from their homes or otherwise displaced. A fall back BECC can be set up at the Depot in Baths Road if the Civic Centre site was compromised.
- 3.22 As part of our commitment to exercising our plans the BECC was established as part of Exercise Unified Response and Operation Away Day.

Borough Resilience Forum (BRF).

- 3.23 Each Borough in London is required to establish a Borough Resilience Forum which.
1. Maintains a local risk register.
 2. Has a systematic, planned and co-ordinated approach to
 - Risk
 - Planning for emergencies
 - Planning for business continuity management
 - Publishing information about risk assessments and plans
 - Arrangements to inform and warn the public
 - Other aspects of civil protection duty, including the promotion of business continuity management by local authorities
 3. Supports the preparation of multi-agency plans and protocols and coordinates multi-agency exercises and training.

Laurie Grasty, our Emergency Planning Manager, currently chairs the Forum and acts as its secretary.

Risk Register

- 3.24 The Borough Risk Register reflects National and Regional risks where appropriate to local conditions and identifies specific local risks. In our case examples of a specific local risk include Biggin Hill Airport and the Waste for Fuel site.

Plans

- 3.25 The Emergency Planning Manager is responsible for the preparation and maintenance of 28 Borough Plans. These are common to all Boroughs and form part of the Minimum Standards for London. Each year we are audited on 8 of these. This year we will be audited on
1. Generic Emergency Plan
 2. Shelter
 3. Evacuation
 4. Identification of the Vulnerable

5.Warning and Informing

6.Excess Deaths

7.Pandemic Flu

8.Severe Weather

Training

- 3.26 Training staff who are involved in emergency planning and response is fundamental to our ability to handle any type of emergency.
- 3.27 Training is about raising the awareness of our key staff about what the emergencies are that they may face and giving them confidence in our procedures and their ability to carry them out successfully. It is also about developing competencies and skill-sets so that staff can fulfil key roles.
- 3.28 All our emergency response staff are volunteers and have daytime jobs, often far removed from their volunteering role.
- 3.29 In the last year we have provided training for Rest Centre Managers, Rest Centre Staff LALO's and BECC Managers.

Exercises

- 3.30 Planning for emergencies cannot be considered reliable until it is exercised and has proved to be workable.
- 3.31 The Civil Contingencies Act requires the Council to exercise and train staff in emergency plans. Similar requirements apply to business continuity plans.

Exercises have 3 main purposes:

- to validate plans
- to develop staff competencies and give them practice in carrying out their roles in the plans (training)
- to test well-established procedures (testing)

3.32 In the last 12 months we have taken part in

1. Operation Awayday (Train crash)
2. Exercise Corvus (Pandemic Flu)
3. Exercise Swiftstrike (Plane crash)
4. Exercise Connects (Communications)
5. Exercise Safer city (Pan London incident)
6. Operation Unified Response (Major train crash and building collapse)

Recovery following an Incident

3.33 The Council is responsible for leading the Recovery after an incident. During an incident fire and ambulance services have high activity over a short period of time, police involvement will be more protracted, particularly where a crime has been committed. However there will come a time when the immediate response is at an end and the police will hand over the chair of the Strategic Coordination Group to the Council. This point marks the start of a new phase of the incident, although preparation for the recovery phase should begin much earlier. This period is unpredictable; can be labour intensive; and may stretch local authorities to extraordinary levels. (Home Office Recovery An Emergency Management Guide)

- Rebuilding the community
- Managing the financial implications
- Managing resources
- Responding to community welfare needs
- Developing strategic issues

Local Emergencies

3.34 In the last 12 months we have responded to 4 incidents

- Gas leak in Penge (Rest Centre set up)
- Suspect Unexploded bomb in St Mary Cray
- Suspect Package in INTU
- Gas pipe fracture outside a building following motor vehicle accident.
-

In addition we have been called upon to advise and assist the LFB in 5 other minor incidents

Voluntary Sector and Faith Groups

3.35 The voluntary sector has a wide range of services that can be called on in the event of an emergency. We have a Memorandum of Understanding with the British Red Cross to assist with the establishment and operation of rest centres for displaced people and to signpost people to other services .

3.36 We work with the Arch Deacon for Bromley and Bexley and the multi-faith group which provide faith support in times of an emergency. The Samaritans can provide support to those who in the community who are psychologically affected by an incident. The Salvation Army will attend a major incident to provide refreshment to the blue light services in attendance and victims.

Corporate Resilience (Business Continuity).

3.37 The Civil Contingencies Act requires the Council to have plans to ensure that we can continue to perform our functions in the event of an emergency.

3.38 It may be helpful to think of the business continuity management (BCM) duty in two strands. In practice, our plans need to ensure that we can:

- Continue to exercise our civil protection functions.
- Continue to perform our ordinary functions

3.39 A Business Continuity Plan cannot be considered reliable until it is exercised and has proved to be workable. As part of the Business Continuity process there is a continual need to prove plans and strategies by testing. No matter how well designed and thought-out our business continuity

arrangements appear to be, a series of robust and realistic exercises will identify areas that require amendment.

- 3.40 Whilst there is assurance from the individual Directorates that they have updated Business Continuity plans there is no Corporate overview. None of the plans have been independently reviewed or tested / exercised and with the current resource there is no capacity to undertake this.

4. IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN

- 4.1 The Councils Emergency Planning and Business Resilience arrangements are specifically targeted at those who are identified as being vulnerable. (See Para 3.5). Exactly who is vulnerable will depend on the specific nature of the emergency. Those who are generally self-reliant and can help themselves tend to do so leaving those who cannot as being vulnerable. We have a vulnerability protocol to assist us identify who may be vulnerable.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Fortunately emergencies and serious incidents are rare but they do occur and they are by their nature impossible to predict. It is essential that the Council can respond effectively and efficiently when called upon.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 A major incident or emergency in the Borough or in London could have very significant financial consequences. The Council has to bear these costs but might be able to recoup an element through the Bellwin Scheme. This is a discretionary scheme providing for Central Government assistance in exceptional circumstances.
- 6.2 The nature of the emergency will influence the financial implications. These could range from thousands of pounds for short term shelter to millions in the case of a major accident or incident. These costs include the longer term recovery costs. Bromley has a Designated National Emergency Mortuary (NEMA) site that would require activation in the event of mass fatalities in London.
- 6.3 The Emergency Planning budget for 2016/17 is £78.1k and the service is run by 1 member of staff.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The Council is classified as a Category 1 responder and has duties as set out in this report to prepare for emergencies and have business continuity plans in place to enable it to provide an appropriate response and maintain essential services.

8. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The Council has one full time Emergency Planning & Corporate Resilience Manager. The rest of the Councils response is based on volunteers.

9. PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The Emergency Planning & Business Resilience service procures a number of services. These include
- Airwaves Radios for communication with London Resilience Team, local boroughs and our own emergency staff. Annual contract value £3000

- Everbridge Mass Communications system for contacting on call staff. Annual contract value £ £7000
- British Red Cross who support the operation of rest centres and help with humanitarian assistance. Annual contract value £2000
- Veolia Emergency Response support. Annual contract value £1500
- The Council's contractors need to have their own Business Continuity plans to ensure they can continue to operate during times of stress.

Non-Applicable Sections:	[List non-applicable sections here]
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	[Title of document and date]

FINAL INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT
ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

FOLLOW UP REVIEW OF THE STRAY DOGS CONTRACT
2016-17

Issued to: Jim McGowan, Head of Environmental Protection
Dan Jones, Assistant Director, Street Scene and Greenspace
Nigel Davies, Executive Director ECS
Claire Martin, Head of Finance, ECS

Prepared by: Principal Auditor

Date of Issue: 17th November 2016
Report No.: ECS/012/01/2016

INTRODUCTION

1. This report sets out the results of our systems based follow up audit of the Stray Dogs Contract. The audit was carried out in quarter 3 as part of the programmed work specified in the 2016/17 Internal Audit Plan, agreed by the Director of Finance and Audit Sub-Committee.
2. The controls we expect to see in place are designed to minimise the department's exposure to a range of risks. Weaknesses in controls that have been highlighted will increase the associated risks and should therefore be corrected to assist overall effective operations.

AUDIT SCOPE

3. This follow up review of the stray dog's contract considered the progress made on implementing the agreed recommendations identified in the final Internal Audit report issued in November 2015. The review included interviews with the Head of Service, Assistant Director Street Scene and Greenspace and responsible officers in the Public Protection Division, and documented current working practices. Contractor A provided the Bromley dog register as at the 28.9.16, downloaded from the SharePoint site. From this spreadsheet stray dog collections for May and June 2016 were tested to ensure compliance to agreed procedures and contractual arrangements with each provider. All dogs returned to their owner during the sample period were checked to income records and invoices submitted by contractor B for May and June 2016 were checked to the dog register and supporting documentation. The findings of the follow review up are discussed in the paragraphs below with an opinion as to whether the recommendation has been implemented, partially implemented or is still outstanding.

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

4. The review of the stray dog contracts was commissioned by the Executive Director of ECS following issues raised by the Head of Audit in May 2015. The Internal Audit report, finalised in November 2015, identified 9 priority 1 recommendations relating to contractual arrangements with providers, contract management, compliance to contract procedure rules and financial regulations, value for money and income and expenditure procedures. The full report was presented to Audit Sub Members on the 1st December 2015 and an update on progress taken to the April Committee. Members were informed in April 2016 that management had reacted swiftly to the major issues; retendering the kenneling contract on a pay as you go basis; renegotiating the collection contract and seeking Member approval for two policies relating to rehoming and destruction of stray dogs. The update report concluded that progress had been made for three priority 1 recommendations; contractual arrangements, analytical information reported to Members and the rehoming/do not destroy policy. These recommendations were considered implemented and therefore closed. The priority 1 recommendation relating to supporting documentation held for contracts and the departmental policy to retain documents was partially implemented. Although 5 priority 1 recommendations were outstanding, Internal Audit acknowledged that significant changes and improvements had been made by the Head of Service. Given that the new contract with contractor B had only been operational since February 2016 it was agreed to carry out the follow up audit review after a 6 month period. This follow up review will be reported to Audit Sub in November 2016.

FOLLOW UP REVIEW OF STRAY DOG CONTRACT 2016-17

5. The follow up review was supported by audit testing on source data provided by contractor A, invoices submitted by the suppliers and records maintained by the responsible officers. Interviews were held with officers involved in the stray dog process and also management to determine progress on findings deemed to be departmental. There have been two major changes since the original report; the change in legislation requiring all dogs to be micro chipped, that came in to force on the 1st April and could impact on the volume of dogs collected and sent to kennels and secondly the move to a pay as you go contract rather than block booking reserved kennels.
6. Annual payments to contractor A for the dog collection service have remained at £63K for this financial year. The variation to contract signed in July 2016 has formalised the additional duties that contractor A will undertake to offset the reduced number of stray dog referrals. Payments to contractor B, as at 30/8/16 is £6K; £480 has been paid to contractor C. Contractor A returns show that for the first quarter 2016/17 13 dogs have been collected and returned to owner, 35 dogs collected and transferred to kennels and there were 37 aborted calls. Extrapolating the kenneling costs for the first 3 months the average cost for each dog is £3.6K/35 dogs £103 which represents 10 days in kennel.
7. The follow up review concludes that of the 5 outstanding priority 1 recommendations 2 have been fully implemented relating to waivers and value for money. The 3 recommendations relating to contract monitoring, payment of invoices and collection of income are partially implemented. There are minor findings in all three areas that prevent full implementation but it is acknowledged that the service have made significant progress in all three areas that would warrant a priority 2 recommendation rather than the priority 1. For the 1 partially implemented recommendation, relating to retention of documentation, this is now considered fully implemented. The retention of documents will be routinely tested for all contracts as audit reviews are undertaken in the department.
8. The findings of the follow up work for the April update to Members are shown at Appendix A as well as the audit findings and opinion resulting from the work undertaken in September 2016.

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS (PRIORITY 1)

Page 69

Of the 9 priority 1 recommendations identified in the Internal Report for Stray Dogs, finalised in November 2015, 6 have been completed and the recommendations considered closed. For the remaining 3 recommendations shown as partially implemented in this report, significant progress has been made. Each of these three recommendations had multiple elements and the division has achieved full implementation of some of the elements; in the case of contract monitoring, the recommendations relating to occupancy and block booking became redundant when the service moved to a pay as you go basis. The findings identified during this follow up review for these 3 partially implemented recommendations are now considered to be priority 2 and as such the recommendations will be removed from the priority 1

FOLLOW UP REVIEW OF STRAY DOG CONTRACT 2016-17

list reported to Members. The Stray Dogs contract has now been transferred to an Environmental Health Officer with defined roles and responsibilities for monitoring, income and expenditure processes. During the course of the follow up, findings were discussed with responsible officers and the need to develop a spreadsheet to handle the data that is generated for this service. It is also suggested that the division consider the training needs of both officers, specifically Financial Regulations and Contract Procedure Rules.

DETAILED FINDINGS/MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN

10. Any new findings and re-recommendations are detailed in Appendix B of this report and require management comment. Appendix A provides information on the recommendations that are being followed-up and Appendix C give definitions of the priority categories.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

11. We would like to thank all staff contacted during this review for their help and co-operation

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
1	<p>Review the formal contract arrangements with contractor A for the collection and transfer of stray dogs.</p> <p>Acknowledging that the provision of kennelling is currently under review; formalise a contract for this service once the provider has been selected.</p> <p>Review the contractual terms to ensure that the Authority has the option to renegotiate service provision.</p> <p>Retain a copy of the contracts within the department for reference and monitoring purposes</p> <p>Ensure that any variation to service provision is supported by an adequate audit trail and formalised with the service provider.</p> <p>Priority 1</p>	<p>A desktop review of the contractor A contract has been completed and a meeting has been arranged with the Company to discuss possible variations to the contract.</p> <p>Fourteen local kennels were contacted with the view of providing this service. Six responded stating that they were not interested in taking on local authority stray and abandoned dogs and three companies stated that they were prepared to consider providing this service through until April 2017, as per the Executive report for co-terminosity of contracts.</p> <p>The contract will be for the sixteen or seventeen months through until April 2017, with proposal to review every March.</p> <p>The contracts have historically been held by the Legal Department. However it is now</p>	Oct/Nov 2015	Head of Environmental Protection (HoEP)	<p>Audit Sub Update April 2016</p> <p>The follow up of this recommendation has indicated that following negotiations with contractor A, the existing provider for the dog collection service, a variation to contract has issued but at the time of this report still under negotiation. Although there is a reduction in the number of dogs any saving will be offset against additional services; liaising and updating contractor C and transporting any dog to the overflow unit in Brands Hatch. Contractor A will also provide emergency cover if the nominated kennels is full at a negotiated cost of £14.50 per kennel per day. The fixed cost element of the collection service was £63,565 for 2015/16 and will remain the same for 2016-17.</p> <p>Fourteen local kennels were contacted to tender for the kennelling provision. Responses were received from 6, of which 4 registered an interest and supplied a competitive quote. Providers were asked to quote on a pay as you go basis but would need to keep a number of kennels open to meet the Council's statutory duty. Two quotes were comparable, the third from contractor B, significantly cheaper. Contractor B met the criteria. The number of dogs collected and taken to kennels had been decreasing since 2012/13 and with the change in legislation for all dogs to be microchipped, strays should be reunited with their owners before kennelling and therefore the capacity at the nominated kennels should be adequate but to cope with any spikes in demand contractor A will provide emergency kennelling.</p> <p>Contractor B has been given a 2 month order for kennelling with a view to issuing a 12 month order if the initial period is successful. This will allow an end date of April 2017 to comply with the Executive directive for contracts to be co terminus. Given the lower unit price of £10 and an average of 6 dogs a day for Bromley the maximum payable to this provider should be £21,900 pa. The specification for kennelling provision was issued with the i-Proc order to</p>	Completed

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
		<p>proposed that a contracts file will be set up, which will hold copies of the contract and all relevant monitoring and review records.</p> <p>The contracts file will contain all contract variations and all associated paperwork.</p>			<p>ensure that basic terms and conditions can be applied.</p> <p>A copy of the variation to contract and the specification is retained in the contract folder held in the shared area. Access to amend and delete is limited to the contract owner and line report to ensure the documents are protected. The development of the contract monitoring document for Public Protection will require managers to specify both hard and soft copies of contracts.</p> <p>September 2016</p> <p>A 12 month I-Proc for 2016-17 was issued to both Contractor B and Contractor C. The variation to contract was signed by Contractor A and Bromley July 2016.</p>	
2	<p>Establish contract folders in the team's shared area for a soft copy trail of all key information.</p> <p>The Authority must, independent to the contractor's advice, evidence service delivery changes in terms of need and cost to verify that value for money options have been evaluated. Documentation should be evidenced that both parties accept the service changes.</p> <p>Ensure that all officers transfer relevant e-mails to the contract folder</p>	<p>This is being carried out; see comment above.</p> <p>All service delivery changes will be evidenced in writing by both parties and stored in the contracts file in order to provide an audit trail.</p> <p>All documentation, computerised notes, emails, faxes, letters and any other</p>	Nov/Dec 2015	HoEP	<p>Audit Sub Update April 2016</p> <p>This recommendation related to the loss of information when key officers left the organisation and the availability of contract information in a shared area. Variation to service delivery had been verbal or confirmed by e-mail but was not then available for audit inspection. The follow up of this recommendation has shown that the HoEP confirmed a change in working practice to ensure that all matters relating to contracts were supported by e-mail, stored in the contract folder in the shared area. The EDM confirmed that the contract monitoring summary that is being developed for Public Protection will detail all variations and links to the supporting documentation, waiver committee report as appropriate.</p>	Partially Implemented

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
	<p>in a timely manner to ensure continuity of information.</p> <p>Ensure that any information pertinent to a contract is recovered from an officer due to leave the Authority.</p> <p>The Department should review their retention of documents policy to ensure it complies with Financial Regulations. This includes any information that is held within e-mails.</p> <p>Priority 1</p>	<p>communications will be transferred to and stored in the contracts file.</p> <p>The storage and recovery of officer held information is a Departmental and prior to review, corporate matter and advice is being sought as to how this should be progressed.</p> <p>To protect the contracts locally in the interim, all paperwork associated with the contracts will be stored on the contracts file where it cannot be deleted. This is subject to a departmental Review; see above comments</p>			<p>September 2016</p> <p>Internal Audit were given access to the Environmental Protection shared drive and confirmed that the contracts folder contains contract information appertaining to the management of the stray dogs contract. Following the previous Internal Audit review and subsequent management review the Lead Practitioner in the Environmental Protection Team was nominated as the contract lead for stray dogs and the manager for all associated administrative tasks. This officer recently left the Authority and responsibility now passed to an Environmental Health Officer. The handover was adequately supported by the trail of documentation held in the contracts folder.</p>	Completed
3	<p>Ensure that analytical information reported to Members can be evidenced to supporting source data. This relates to the 15% saving quoted to be achieved by procuring kennelling direct from Contractor D, not evidenced.</p> <p>[Priority 1]</p>	<p>As identified in this audit, a considerable amount of evidentiary material was missing, subsequent to the Contract monitoring officer being made redundant and leaving the Authority.</p> <p>As per recommendation 2 above, the contracts file will contain all necessary evidence, including the analytical information and will be stored such that it cannot be deleted/removed/destroyed without the appropriate Managerial authority.</p>	Oct 2015	HoEP	<p>Audit Sub Update April 2016</p> <p>This relates to the 15% saving quoted to be achieved by procuring kennelling direct from contractor D that was not evidenced. Management approached the former contract manager, responsible for the information provided and it was established that contractor A were planning to impose a 15% admin charge for processing contractor D invoices. As this recommendation relates to an event in the past and the process covered by the move to shared contract folders, this priority 1 recommendation is considered closed.</p>	Completed

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
4	<p>Review the current arrangements for a rehoming service as the Authority currently part fund a rehoming officer employed by the provider.</p> <p>Declare the non-statutory element as a potential saving within the service. Formalise the Authority's policy for rehoming stray dogs as a non-statutory service.</p> <p>Evidence Member opinion that the Authority has a "do not destroy" policy and how this is to be implemented in terms of service, to ensure minimal cost to the Authority. [Priority 1]</p>	<p>The Manager of this service has ceased funding the rehoming service at the kennels and has approached contractor C with regard to re homing the LB Bromley abandoned and stray dogs.</p> <p>Negotiation has been entered into with contractor c for them to take the dogs and rehome them for a one off fee of £40 per dog, (subject to various conditions), which is 50% lower than the quotes received from the Private Kennels.</p> <p>This has not been considered as a potential saving as the cost of euthanasia was generally considered higher than the cost of re homing. This has been confirmed in the recent quotes obtained from three kennels on a pay as you go basis where the euthanasia option is estimated to be £15,000 more than re homing. This will be included in the January PDS Report.</p> <p>In the past the Members of Public Protection and Safety PDS have expressed the requirement for a non-</p>	Dec 2015/Jan 2016	HoEP	<p>Audit Sub Update April 2016</p> <p>The audit review identified that the service was paying £13.5K pa for a rehoming officer employed by the previous nominated kennels. A follow up of this recommendation has shown that this practice ceased and contractor C was approached to take on this function. A flat fee of £40 per dog has been agreed and there are contingency plans with contractor A should contractor C be closed to new dogs for any period of time.</p> <p>Members of the Public Protection and Safety PDS at their meeting on 20th January 2016 agreed to formalise two policies; the euthanasia of banned breeds or those dogs unsuitable for re-homing and secondly the kennelling of dogs deemed fit to be rehomed that had not been claimed after the statutory period.</p>	Completed

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
4 Con		<p>destruct policy. However, this needs to be evidenced as it does not appear in the recorded Minutes of the meetings.</p> <p>In view of this recommendation to declare a saving on this non-statutory element of the service and to formalise the Authority's Policy, of rehoming or destroying all such dogs in achieve this saving, a formal Report will be put before members at the January PDS to make this decision.</p> <p>This was not a recommendation discussed with JM and it should be noted that a policy of destruction for healthy, unwanted dogs would result in the existing Dog Warden contractor refusing to work with Bromley and closing down the contract and most kennels, including contractor C also refusing to work with Bromley Council. Being associated with a Borough that has a positive policy to destroy healthy dogs is unacceptable to most of the people/companies in this business and it is unlikely that Bromley would be able to provide a service.</p>				

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
5	<p>Review contract monitoring for this service to ensure compliance to CPR 23.</p> <p>For a service that is procured as block booked units, management must evidence that utilisation is regularly monitored to evidence continued need and thus value for money. Underutilisation is a cost to the Authority and should be addressed in contract monitoring meetings.</p>	<p>A review of the Contract Monitoring Rules in CPR section 23.5 is to be carried out for the whole Department as part of a wider Corporate review. Appropriate action to ensure full compliance with CPR 23.5 will be taken, subject to advice from Procurement</p> <p>The use of block booking does not provide for any refund for underutilisation. The kennels are pre booked for the exclusive use of the Council in order to meet their Statutory responsibility. They were paid for whether vacant or occupied in order to ensure LB Bromley exclusivity as previously explained. However, in view of the Audit comments, this procedure has been dropped and the Council will now book the kennels on a pay as you go basis.</p> <p>The action plan provides more detail on this new proposal as there is a risk that the Authority may have no kennel in which to place some dogs and a number of back up plans will need to</p>	Oct 2015 and Jan 2016 for ownership issues	HoEP	<p>Audit Sub Update April 2016</p> <p>A meeting was held with the Environmental Development Manager (EDM) who had been tasked with reviewing the departmental issues relating to contract management and compliance to contract procedure rules. The EDM and the HoEP are currently producing the contract management summary for Public Protection in line with the document produced for Environment and Community Services; recognised as an example of good practice for contract management and monitoring.</p> <p>The follow up of this recommendation has shown that as the kennelling contract was awarded to contractor B on a pay as you go basis the monitoring of usage/occupancy is important and the service monitor actual usage patterns to identify if more favourable terms can be negotiated at a later date. The service will reconcile data from contractor A to the kennelling returns. The team have developed a spreadsheet to record each dog collected to then track the dog through to outcome, including costs and income due. KPI's for contractor A would be identified once the draft variation to contract has been returned.</p> <p>At the time of the follow up review, no contract monitoring meetings had been held; the new service and kennelling arrangements have only been operational since the end of January 2016. It is planned to hold quarterly monitoring meetings with both providers, the minutes to be scanned and stored in the contract folder in the shared area.</p> <p>The EDM confirmed that the contract monitoring summaries, published for Environment and Community and currently being reviewed for Public Protection, will collate all the information required for effective monitoring.</p>	Progress to implement

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
5 Co	<p>The department must account for the monthly occupancy sheets prior to payment of an invoice and interpret the data recorded to identify underutilisation.</p> <p>The duration of kennelling for each dog should not exceed statutory requirements or locally agreed limits, (as evidenced by a contract), when the ownership has passed to the kennels.</p>	<p>be put in place to protect the Council's position in the case that several dogs are collected at in a short period of time and there are no vacant kennels available. The statistics have been analysed and the risk calculated as approximately 10% of the time the Council will not be able to meet its statutory duty and the action plan describes the processes that are being put in place to address this risk. There will be no underutilisation as the proposal is to move to a pay as you go system.</p> <p>All invoices will continue to be checked to occupancy and reconciled with contractor A statistics, on a monthly basis, prior to payment.</p> <p>The duration of occupancy is of no concern to the Council once ownership is passed to a third party as all subsequent costs are also transferred with ownership.</p> <p>Local Authority has a Statutory duty to kennel the dog for seven days and on day eight must decide whether to put the dog up for rehoming or to destroy the dog.</p>			<p>September 2016</p> <p>The EDM confirmed that all Public Protection contracts are now included in the contract monitoring summary for Environmental Services. Contract monitoring for the whole Council is being further developed so that the contract summaries held as Word documents on Sharepoint, will be a database that will upload and collate information from other sources such as FBM. Managers will be responsible for the information held on the database and updating as necessary. The database will provide the contract information to be reported to all PDS Committees and Contracts Sub Committee to allow continuity and accuracy. The timescale for this project is early 2017.</p> <p>The Technical Support Team Manager in the Street Scene and Greenspace division has developed a dashboard reporting tool to enable more effective contract monitoring. The system has been trialled with the street cleansing contract and will be rolled out to all contracts within the division including PP. Information is collected from all sources and used to identify trends, peaks and troughs; contract managers will be asked to explain variances.</p> <p>The procurement of kennels from the provider is still on a pay as you go basis. Information is transferred from contractor A's schedule to Uniform and then checked to the monthly invoices received for each dog held at the nominated kennels. There is no apparent register of dogs submitted by the kennel provider to summarise the duration of kennelling or the outcome. This was discussed with the Public Protection team and has been raised at the next contract monitoring meeting with contractor A as discussed below.</p> <p>There were 5 invoices received from contractor C since the new contractual arrangements, relating to 12 dogs. The information shown on these invoices was not consistent</p>	Partially implemented

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
5 Co	<p>Any negotiation to reserve a fixed number of kennels must be supported by a financial analysis to consider the occupancy rates, length of stay and alternative cost of paying an enhanced rate for kennelling above reserved units.</p> <p>If the kennelling contract necessitates reserved units, consideration should be given to a credit clause to offset for periods of non-occupancy. As a minimum the contract negotiations should demonstrate arrangements that are fair to both parties.</p> <p>The data from contractor A should be reconciled to the dog register maintained by contractor D (or alternative kennelling contractor) to ensure that the total number of dogs agrees.</p>	<p>At present I am unaware of any local authority that has such a destruction policy and who pay to kennel only for the statutory seven days for healthy dogs but this matter will be put to Members for them to make a decision at the January 2016 PDS.</p> <p>This is no longer happening; see comments above.</p> <p>This is no longer happening; see previous comments.</p> <p>This will now be carried out monthly.</p>			<p>with the kennel invoice and contractor A spreadsheet. Each provider allocates their own reference number and for the 3 dogs checked to May and June invoices the date of seizure and description of the dog differed.</p> <p>The Environmental Health Officer who has recently taken over responsibility for this contract is looking to develop a spreadsheet to record all pertinent information and track the outcome of each dog, tying in expenditure and income details as appropriate from all providers.</p> <p>The audit testing on the kennelling invoices for May and June 2016 showed that 10 dogs went to kennel in each month. Of these 20 cases:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 dogs were kennelled for less than 7 days, 5, 8 to 30 days, 3, 31 to 60 days and 1 dog was kennelled for 84 days. There was no evidence to support that contractor C had been approached to take the dogs once the statutory 7 days had expired. It was not clear which provider should notify contractor C that a dog is going to need transfer and rehoming or that LBB monitor that this part of the process is followed. 	New Rec.

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
5 Co	<p>Contract monitoring should be effective to ensure that key performance indicators are met and that any defaults are identified.</p> <p>Contract meetings should be minuted and available on the shared area. Similarly, if contract meetings are to be held for exception purposes only this should be evidenced as mutually agreed and regularly post that both parties agree that no issues are arising.</p> <p>[Priority 1]</p>	<p>This has always been carried out. A check revealed only one failure by contractor A to meet the 95% pick up rate within four hours, where they achieved 88.8%. This was due to two dogs being held in a veterinary surgery that was not open at the time of receipt of the call and as such no further action was taken. However, this process has been tightened up to ensure that the new kennels meet their required standards and all such comments are recorded within the contracts file.</p> <p>This is in place and all subsequent documentation will be held on the Contracts file.</p>			<p>Contract monitoring meetings are now planned with contractor A quarterly, although only the July meeting will be on site at the Council offices, the other three meetings will be a telephone conference call. The minutes of the monitoring meeting for July 2016 were reviewed and evidenced a range of topics covered and action points noted. These minutes indicated that “the register is dual managed with contractor A updating the collection and movement details and LBB updating the outcome from kennels. The minutes of the telephone conference call on 10/10/16 were evidenced and showed a similar level of detail. These minutes raised the issue of the dog register and a suggestion that the next contract should “account for the kennel to update the register with the outcome of the dog”. In the interim period either LBB issue the provider with a SharePoint licence or update the online register with the outcome as advised by the kennel.</p> <p>A change in contract manager in the Public Protection team prompted a joint visit to the nominated kennels on the 15th June 2016. The site visit was to ensure that the handover was effective and satisfy the requirements for contract monitoring of the kennel provider.</p>	

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
6	<p>The department must review the waiver process to ensure that all documents comply with CPR.</p> <p>The roles and responsibilities of each officer involved in the process should be clarified specifically the need for all appropriate officers to authorise the waiver. The initiating officer should ensure that appropriate officers have authorised the waiver to evidence scrutiny by Legal and Finance.</p> <p>The department should review the administrative arrangements for the waiver process to ensure that all waivers are “captured” and held by a responsible officer.</p> <p>Reconciliation to the departmental contract register should ensure that continuing a contract past the expiry date is supported by a waiver.</p> <p>The authorising officer must ensure that the waiver adequately details the reason for the waiver and that there is documented evidence to support this. Similarly the report must demonstrate that continuing with a provider will not be at a cost to the Authority and value for money is still achieved.</p> <p>The Chief Officer should only authorise a waiver that has been seen</p>	<p>The Department will conduct a full review of the waiver process after advice is sought from Procurement and Legal and a new procedure will be developed.</p> <p>The roles and responsibilities of each officer within the Council will be clarified as part of the review and training will be arranged on the new procedure.</p>	Jan 2016	HoEP and CO	<p>Audit Sub Update April 2016</p> <p>A follow up of this recommendation has shown that at service level, the HoEP has developed a procedure and work flow to ensure that the appropriate officers receive, review and authorise any waiver. This includes the type of information to be included in the justification section; the reason for the waiver and assurance of continued value for money. The cumulative spend and whole life costs will also be specified. A line specific to the Head of Finance has been included to evidence that finance have cleared the information reported. Once all comments have been received from the Chief Officer, legal and finance the HoEP will ensure that the document is signed and filed.</p> <p>At a departmental level, the EDM confirmed that a system exists for extensions on the ECS Business Management team site, on One Bromley, this includes the waiver register, contract procedure rules for waivers and exemptions and the waiver template. This information has been available on the departmental team site but it was accepted that officers needed to be reminded of the process and where to access and log forms.</p> <p>Internal Audit review all waivers collated and reported to this committee. For the 6 waivers declared by Environment and Community Services for this cycle there are no issues arising regarding authorisations.</p> <p>September 2016</p> <p>At a corporate level, waivers have been reviewed and rolled out to officers as part of the new Contract Procedure Rules.</p> <p>A review of the authorised corporate procurement templates held by ECS between March 2016 and September 2016 identified that Public Protection has not</p>	<p>Progress to implement</p> <p>Implemented</p>

Page 74

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
	<p>and initialled by the Head of Finance as per the DMT minutes for 26.11.13</p> <p>This review has identified that the waiver process is not clearly understood by officers. The department should identify and instigate training to eliminate the ambiguities of this process, namely the status of a contract once expired but procurement with the same contractor is continued.</p> <p>Officers should identify whole life costs and cumulative spend to ensure that the waiver document accurately reflects actual spend with the preferred contractor.</p> <p>[Priority 1]</p>				<p>submitted any waivers during this period. There was an authorised template to extend a contract for the CCTV service and this had been duly completed, signed and dated and will be considered during the CCTV follow up audit.</p> <p>An Internal Audit review of waivers reports is currently being undertaken to confirm that the process to waive any requirements for competitive bids has been carried out as set out in Contract Procedure Rules.</p>	
7	<p>The Department must ensure that the procedures to receipt and approve invoices for payment are robust and compliant to Financial regulations.</p>	<p>This will form part of the Departmental Review to ensure that robust procedures for receipting and approving invoices exist and are adhered to. However, it is recognised that not every entry of every line has been checked over the last ten years that were audited and the Department will identify a resource to carry out this function into the future.</p>	<p>Oct 2015 Jan 2016</p>	<p>CO and HoEP</p>	<p>Audit Sub Update April 2016</p> <p>I-Proc orders have now been raised in advance of the service being procured but as the new contract started in February 2016 no invoices had been received. The roles and responsibility of the officer tasked with the payment of invoices has been clarified and this will be tested during the follow up. The contractor has been made aware of the documentation that will be required to support any variable fees charged to the Authority on the monthly invoice.</p>	<p>Progress to implement</p>

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
	<p>The need to pay for any service in advance should be with the approval of the Director of Finance.</p> <p>The role of the officer responsible for expenditure should be agreed. Compliance to agreed tasks should be regularly reviewed and challenged specifically for expenditure that was raised by management as queries.</p> <p>An order should be raised in advance of the committed expenditure and not after the invoice has been received. [Priority 1]</p>	<p>The purchase of any advance services within the Division has been stopped. An alternative method of providing the service is to be instigated.</p> <p>The budget holder is identified as the HoEP and his role within the expenditure of this budget will be defined by the Senior Management of the Department. Such Senior Management will then identify tasks, be responsible for the review and will challenge any management queries.</p> <p>Orders are now raised in advance of expenditure not after the invoice has been received.</p>			<p>September 2016</p> <p>The payment of invoices has now been transferred to the administrative officer who is also tasked with the collection of income. The combination of both income and expenditure processes has allowed an element of continuity for the collection and kenneling of dogs, a familiarity of each case and the benefit of seeing each case through from start to finish.</p> <p>I Proc orders have been raised for the financial year 2016-17; contractor C £5,000 and contractor B £12,000. As at the end of August 2016, £6K has been paid to the kennels and £480 to contractor C.</p> <p>The process for receipting and checking invoices is now supported by a written procedure available in a shared folder.</p> <p>Interviews with the administrative officer and the line manager indicated an understanding of Financial Regulations and the checks that are now undertaken before each invoice is passed for payment.</p> <p>May and June 2016 were selected as sample months for audit testing. Following the audit report and the commencement of the contract with the nominated kennels, the manager requested monthly invoices for each dog held by the provider. The invoices detail start and end dates and specify "interim" invoice for dogs that are held over the month. Vet fees are broken down over each charge category and are supported by scanned copies of the invoice from the vet and receipt of payment by the kennels</p> <p>9 dogs were taken to kennels in May (1 to Slough), 10 in June. The invoices were checked to the agreed fees and</p>	<p>Partially implemented</p>

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
					<p>charges; the main issues arising were:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1/19 - kennel fees for 28 days charged should be £280 but £800 levied as exceptional circumstances and the dog had a litter of puppies. Although the budget holder had authorised the additional spend there was no audit trail on the invoice to support payment. • 1/19 – kennel fees for 2 days; narrative states “transfer to Greenwich” and “dog found in Greenwich”. Insufficient detail to confirm Bromley’s liability. • Kennel fees exceeding the statutory 7 days; for the 3 cases that spanned monthly invoices there was no evidence that contractor C had been contacted for a place or the status of a possible transfer for rehoming. <p>The 5 invoices submitted by contractor C identified 3 dogs that had been transferred in the sample months checked. The information on these invoices did not tie up with the data from the other two contractors; the seizure date was different and contractor C allocates their own reference number. The date that the dog was transferred did tally to the departure date from the kennels. Contractor C have charged a £15 transfer fee and £25 vet fee per dog however this has not been verified as correct given the I-Proc order does not specify the agreed rate. The I-Proc order refers to “agreed schedule of rates” and this has now been made available to the administrative officer responsible for the payment of invoices.</p>	New Rec.

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
8	<p>The Department should review the procedures to identify all income due and ensure that controls are robust to collect that income.</p> <p>Collect the £1,524.97 income due from contractor A for quarter 1 2014/15.</p> <p>Consider the policy to collect payment prior to the dog being returned, as stated on the website and how this can be enforced.</p> <p>[Priority 1]</p>	<p>A review is currently in process.</p> <p>The incumbent dog Warden contractor currently releases confined dogs on payment of outstanding debt directly to them on behalf of the Council. In accordance with Audit recommendations, it will be proposed to Members in the January Committee Report that all owners are invoiced</p> <p>This has been invoiced, along with all of the 2015/16 outstanding income and payment is awaited.</p> <p>In a significant number of cases, it is not practicable to receive payment before returning the dog to the owner. However, a new procedure is being set up with contractor A, whereby they will endeavour to recoup all fees prior to the return of the dog if it is within the first three days and returned from their kennel or if a dog is returned to the owner from the Bromley nominated kennel between 3 and 10 days. In all other instances,</p>	<p>Oct 2015 Jan 2016</p>	<p>HoEP</p>	<p>Audit Sub Update April 2016</p> <p>The team have reviewed the task of income collection and have introduced a process to monitor dogs collected and returned to ensure all income due can be identified and recovered. As previously discussed it is anticipated that the majority of dogs will be identified and returned to their owner before incurring kennel fees, however owners will be expected to pay the £25 statutory fee. As with expenditure, the arrangements for income will need to be operational for 6 months before audit testing can effectively assure that the recommendation has been implemented. The £1,524.97 owing from contractor A is still outstanding due to delays in the processing of the invoice by the Exchequer contractor.</p> <p>September 2016</p> <p>Interviews with the administrative officer and the line manager indicated an understanding of Financial Regulations with regard to the collection of income. An exchange of emails with contractor A in August 2016 identified that the need for all owners to be charged the statutory £25 (even if the dog is returned directly to the owner) needed to be clarified. In practice, LBB are invoicing all owners of micro chipped dogs as the owner details are available and recorded by contractor A. The contract monitoring minutes for October 2016 record that this issue has been discussed with the contractor and agreed. Contractor A have been requested to inform all owners, as the dog is returned, that a £25 fee will be levied by the Council.</p> <p>The charging policy for stray dogs is set out on the Bromley website including the statutory payment of £25 for dogs that are identified and returned on the same day. The kenneling fee is shown as £15; this should be corrected to £10 to reflect the cost paid to the provider.</p> <p>May and June 2016 were selected as the sample months for audit testing. The dogs returned to owner (RTO) should be charged the statutory fee of £25; dogs returned from the</p>	<p>Progress to implement</p> <p>Partially Implemented</p> <p>New Rec.</p>

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
8 Co		LBB will invoice the owner after the dog has been returned			<p>kennels will be required to contact contractor A offices and pay by debit/credit card before the dog is returned, the fee is £25 statutory fee, £100 return fee (reduced by 50% if microchipped) and £10 per night in kennels.</p> <p>May:- 25 calls - 10 aborted/10 dogs to kennel/5 RTO June 27 calls – 14 aborted/10 dogs to kennel/3 RTO</p> <p>For the 8 RTO tested, 7 had been identified from the contractors record and an invoice request submitted to the Exchequer contractor. The missing RTO was a dog that was collected on the 3/5 and the 11/5 but each occasion should have been charged. As previously reported, once the invoice has been requested it is the responsibility of the Exchequer contractor and the debtors process to recover income.</p> <p>For the 20 dogs taken to kennel, 11 were claimed by their owner and returned. In all cases contractor A have collected the fees due. The HoEP evidenced the quarterly statement submitted by the contractor for April to June 2016 but had not undertaken any reconciliation at the time of the audit. Audit checks identified 2 cases for £145 and £185 that had not been declared on the schedule. It was also identified that contractor A were collecting £25 and £100 as statutory fees and the overnight kennel rate although only £125 statutory fees were being declared on the schedule.</p> <p>Finance provided a Discoverer report from ORACLE to detail all transactions on the stray dogs income code. The sample of 7 requests for invoice was checked; 1 was open and 6 had been paid and closed. The £1524.97 outstanding fees from quarter 1, 2014/15 due from contractor A could not be found in the accounts. The contractor confirms that all fees have been submitted to Bromley. The HoEP is currently liaising with the Income Team, (Exchequer contract) to account for all income collected matched to request for debtor invoices raised by the stray dogs team.</p>	New Rec

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
					Once the quarterly schedules are received from contractor A, the fees collected should be reconciled to the master sheet retained by the team to ensure all income is collected. This task will be undertaken by the administrative officer.	
9	<p>This review has identified significant shortcomings regarding value for money issues. The department should regularly bench mark the costs and income of this service and formally report these findings. Any contractual arrangements should demonstrate value for money. For a variable service, provision needs to be regularly reviewed to assure that ongoing value is achieved.</p> <p>[Priority 1]</p>	<p>The Audit value for money argument primarily revolves around what Audit refers to as “underutilisation” of kennels. As previously stated by the Service Manager, the whole purpose of pre –booking kennels was to guarantee that LBB had vacant kennels where their stray and abandoned dogs could be placed in order to comply with the Statutory obligations. As evidenced to the Auditor, this was known over a year ago by Procurement and Finance and was not challenged as a Policy.</p> <p>With regard to the practicalities of running this service, the kennel owner has to turn away customers in order to keep the allocated kennels vacant for the Council and as such would not then agree to a rebate because the Council did not fill them to capacity, 100% of the time. This is in line with the Procedures of other Local Authorities and the private sector.</p>	Jan 2016	HoEP	<p>Audit Sub Update April 2016</p> <p>One of the main issues arising from the audit review was that the block booking of 9 kennels, pre-paid did not offer value for money. The change in service delivery to pay as you go should offer improved value for money as actual usage is charged. The recent tender exercise identified a cheaper provider for the kennelling element, a reduction from £15 per unit to £10 per unit, however the 2 month pilot will be used to measure the performance of this supplier before committing to a 12 month contract.</p> <p>The HoEP continues to bench mark against neighbouring Authorities and this information will be made available in any reports or waivers that may be presented.</p> <p>September 2016</p> <p>The new contractual arrangements with contractor B and the variation to contract with contractor A have now been operational for 9 months. The follow up review of the stray dogs contract has evidenced significant progress in all areas of service delivery; contract monitoring, payment of invoices and collection of income. With improved checking and recording the team is now routinely monitoring value for money issues. The contract has now been assigned to a manager within the division and the roles and responsibilities defined to ensure that trends and performance are measured.</p> <p>The move from block booked kennels to “pay as you go” has achieved the savings identified in the original audit report and allowed the Authority to meet their statutory duties. Extrapolating the kenneling costs for the first 3 months of 2016/17, the average cost for each dog is £3.6K kennel costs/35 dogs = £103 per dog, which represents 10</p>	<p>Progress to implement</p> <p>Implemented</p>

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
9 Co		<p>However, it is proposed to move the Council to a pay as you go system with no guaranteed kennels pre-booked.</p> <p>Also, in accordance with this Report, the proposed kennel for the Council to accept will be the cheapest quote. However, it must be noted that it only has six kennels available for Council use. There will be a subsequent risk that the Council will not be able to meet its statutory obligations if six or more dogs are required to be kennelled. For a seven day statutory hold that is less than one dog per day in the same week, whereas the Council has regularly exceeded this.</p> <p>However, analysis of the audit statistics shows that the Council is at risk of failing to meet its statutory duty for 10 % of the time and this may be considered satisfactory to Members at a time when the Division is only committed to a basic Statutory minimum. This will be put to Members for decision at the Committee meeting in January 2016.</p> <p>There are a number of</p>			<p>days in kennel.</p> <p>The legislation that now requires owners to microchip their dogs came into effect 1st April 2016. The October 2016 minutes of the meeting with contractor A recorded that 60% of the dogs collected for the first quarter to June. Being able to identify the dog at the first point of contact allows an early return to the owner and for the Council to invoice the owner to recover fees. Returned dogs that are not chipped are issued with a warning letter and the Authority has held microchipping events to increase take up.</p> <p>The HoEP submitted a report to the Commissioning Board on the 5/9/16 proposing to seek one contractor to take on the whole stray dog service, collection, kenneling and collection of income. Benchmarking costs with neighboring boroughs will be part of the process to retender the service as one entity.</p>	

No	Recommendation	Management Comment	Target Date	Responsibility	Follow-up comments	Status
9 Co		<p>changes to the dog warden contract to be discussed with the provider and will be supported by a variation to contract. These include for contractor A to provide kennelling at their base for the first three days, which will reduce the pressure on the nominated kennels as over 50% of dogs are returned immediately. This percentage may increase when the legislation for owners to microchip their dogs comes into force.</p> <p>A process map has been compiled to support the stray dog service. This shows that contractor C will be notified on the day of seizure to reserve a space; average waiting time is currently 7-10 days.</p>				

Original recommendation No.	Recommendation	Priority	Management Comment	Responsibility	Agreed Timescale
5	<p>The data from contractor A should be reconciled to the dog register maintained by the kennelling contractor to ensure that the total number of dogs agrees.</p> <p>The team should consider developing the spreadsheet to record all key information to be able to trace the dog through the process.</p> <p>The team should clarify which contractor is responsible for referring any stray dog still in kennels and likely to exceed the statutory period. Cases exceeding the 7 day period should be monitored to ensure that the dog can be transferred to contractor C at the earliest opportunity.</p>	<p>2*</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Arrangements have been put in place for contractor A to provide a Licence for the nominated kennels to access their spreadsheet and update the information so that the details and in particular the numbers are the same for both contractors.</p> <p>See comments above.</p> <p>The contractor responsible for this function is contractor B. They are required to contact contractor C immediately after the statutory period has expired and then ring daily thereafter to check if a place has become available. As this could involve hundreds of calls, it has been agreed that the kennel will send a weekly update for the status of each dog and the reason that contractor C have given if they have not been rehomed so that the Council can monitor the process.</p>	<p>HoEP</p> <p>HoEP</p>	<p>December 2016</p> <p>December 2016</p>

7	The Department must ensure that the procedures to receipt and approve invoices for payment are robust and compliant to Financial regulations.	2*	Procedures have been set up to receipt and approve invoices for payment. They are overseen by a Manager and are checked to ensure that they are both robust and compliant to Financial regulations.	HoEP	December 2016
	Any variations to agreed schedule of rates should be authorised by the appropriate officer and supporting documentation available to support that variation.	2	Due to the dynamic and often urgent nature of variations to schedules of rates e.g a stray bitch having ten puppies in the kennels, the authorisation has been verbal in the past. However, the Managers will ensure that any such variations will be confirmed in writing in order to be able to provide the necessary supporting documentation.	HoEP	December 2016
8	The Department should review the procedures to identify all income due and ensure that controls are robust to collect that income.	2*	Arrangements are being made for officers to have access to Oracle and the Discoverer reports so that income may be checked to ensure that it has been received.	HoEP	December 2016
	The schedule of fees collected by contractor A should be received quarterly and reconciled to the Bromley spreadsheet. The contractor should be asked to account for the two missing cases identified in the audit testing and for Bromley to confirm that the total value of fees collected is passed on to the Authority.	2	For the two cases identified by audit, the fees had not been collected when the dog was returned to the owner and should have been invoiced by the Authority; two invoices have now been raised. All of the income	HoEP	December 2016

	<p>The Bromley website should be updated to reflect the charge that will be levied for kenneling</p>		<p>entries will now be checked manually against the quarterly remittance received from contractor A to ensure that they have not missed any payments made to them and this will subsequently be checked again by a Manager.</p> <p>There are current changes to fees being considered at present and the website will be updated once this has been agreed.</p>	<p>HoEP</p>	<p>December 2016</p>
--	--	--	---	-------------	----------------------

Definition of priority categories.

Priority 1

Required to address major weaknesses and should be implemented as soon as possible

Priority 2

Required to address issues which do not represent good practice

Priority 3

Identification of suggested areas for improvement

Extract from the INTERNAL AUDIT PROGRESS REPORT presented to the Audit Sub Committee on Tuesday 29th November 2016.

3.23 Stray Dogs Contract Follow Up

3.24 The original audit report was reported to this Committee as a Part 2 item for contract and management reasons. These are now concluded and the follow up report is summarised below.

3.25 The review of the stray dog contracts was commissioned by the Executive Director of ECS following issues raised by the Head of Audit in May 2015. The Internal Audit report, finalised in November 2015, identified 9 priority 1 recommendations relating to contractual arrangements with providers, contract management, compliance to contract procedure rules and financial regulations, value for money and income and expenditure procedures. The full report was presented to Audit Sub Members on the 1st December 2015 and an update on progress taken to the April Committee. Members were informed in April 2016 that management had reacted swiftly to the major issues; retendering the kennelling contract on a pay as you go basis; renegotiating the collection contract and seeking Member approval for two policies relating to rehoming and destruction of stray dogs. The update report concluded that progress had been made for three priority 1 recommendations; contractual arrangements, analytical information reported to Members and the rehoming/do not destroy policy. These recommendations were considered implemented and therefore closed. The priority 1 recommendation relating to supporting documentation held for contracts and the departmental policy to retain documents was partially implemented. Although 5 priority 1 recommendations were outstanding, Internal Audit acknowledged that significant changes and improvements had been made by the Head of Service. Given the new contract with another kennel supplier had only been operational since February 2016 it was agreed to carry out the follow up audit review after a 6 month period.

3.26 The follow up review was supported by audit testing on source data provided by the contractor for securing stray dogs, invoices submitted by the suppliers and records maintained by the responsible officers. Interviews were held with officers involved in the stray dog process and also management to determine progress on findings deemed to be departmental. There have been two major changes since the original report; the change in legislation requiring all dogs to be micro chipped, that came in to force on the 1st April could impact on the volume of dogs collected and sent to kennels and secondly, the move to a pay as you go contract rather than block booking reserved kennels.

3.27 Annual payments to the stray dogs contractor for the dog collection service have remained at £63K for this financial year. The variation to contract signed in July 2016 has formalised the additional duties that the contractor will undertake to offset the reduced number of stray dog referrals. Payments to Lodge Kennels, as at 30/8/16 is £6K; £480 has been paid to Battersea Dogs and Cat Home (BDCH). The contractor returns show that for the first quarter 2016/17 13 dogs have been collected and returned to owner, 35 dogs collected and transferred to kennels and there were 37 aborted calls. Extrapolating the kennelling costs for the first 3 months the average cost for each dog is £3.6K/35 dogs £103 which represents 10 days in kennel.

3.28 The follow up review concludes that of the 5 outstanding priority 1 recommendations ,2 have been fully implemented relating to waivers and value for money. The 3 recommendations relating to

contract monitoring, payment of invoices and collection of income are partially implemented. There are minor findings in all three areas that prevent full implementation but it is acknowledged that the service have made significant progress in all three areas that would warrant a priority 2 recommendation rather than the priority 1. For the 1 partially implemented recommendation, relating to retention of documentation, this is now considered fully implemented. The retention of documents will be routinely tested for all contracts as audit reviews are undertaken in the department.

As a result of the follow up audit we will not be reporting on this contract as there are no priority one issues.

Report No:
CSD 17009

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee

Date: 18th January 2017

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER**

Contact Officer: Stephen Wood, Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8313 4316 E-mail: stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Mark Bowen, Director of Corporate Services

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 Members are asked to review the Committee's Work Programme and to consider the contracts summary for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.
- 1.2 Members should note that the Work Programme is fluid and subject to change as required.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

2.1 **That the Committee:**

- (i) reviews its Work Programme (Appendix 1); and
- (ii) Comments on the Corporate Contract Register extract and commentary relating to e Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Contracts (Appendix 2).

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Committees normally receive a report on the Work Programme and Contracts Register at each meeting.
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Safer Bromley
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Democratic Services
 4. Total current budget for this head: £335,590
 5. Source of funding: 2016/17 revenue budget
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 8 posts (7.27fte)
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Maintaining the Committee's work programme normally takes less than an hour per meeting.
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None:
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable: This report does not involve an executive decision.
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This report is primarily for the benefit of Committee Members.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

Forward Programme

- 3.1 The table at **Appendix 1** sets out the Public Protection and Safety PDS Forward Work Programme. The Committee is invited to comment on the schedule and to propose any changes it considers appropriate.
- 3.2 Other reports may come into the programme - schemes may be brought forward or there may be references from other Committees, the Portfolio Holder or the Executive.

Contracts Register Summary

- 3.3 Council services are underpinned by contracts and, as a Commissioning Council, it's important that these are tendered in accordance with the newly revised (1 September 2016) Contract Procedure Rules.
- 3.4 A new Council-wide approach to contract reporting has been agreed which involves the entire Corporate Contract Register being reported to Contracts Sub-Committee (latest meeting: 2 November 2016). Relevant extracts are then reported to each subsequent PDS meeting to ensure a consistent approach to contract reporting during each committee cycle.
- 3.5 **Appendix 2** sets out Public Protection & Safety Portfolio's contracts (total contract value of more than £50k), including comments made (by Commissioning & Procurement Division) to the last two Contract Sub-committee meetings:
- It should be noted that both CCTV contracts have been extended to 31 March 2018 (ES16052 - PP&S PDS 28.09.16) and that authority has been delegated to EDE&CS to extend for a further year (to 31 March 2019).
 - Members should also note that that tendering activity has commenced regarding retendering Stray and Abandoned Dogs and Pest Control Services (ES16043 - PP&S PDS 28.09.16).
- 3.6 The Contract Monitoring Summaries pioneered by E&CS and the Corporate Contract Register are currently being merged to form a Corporate Contract Database. This Contract Database will be at the heart of the Council's future Commissioning and Procurement activity and will generate alerts and reports, as required, to ensure timely procurement and consistent Member reporting.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Each PDS Committee is responsible for setting its own work programme.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Financial/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Previous Work Programme Reports and Minutes of the previous meeting.

PP&S PDS COMMITTEE - FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS—18th January 2017
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Draft Budget 2017-2018
Police Update
Internal Audit Stray Dogs Report
Presentation from British Transport Police
Challenger Troop Presentation
Review of Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Service
Animal Welfare Report—Licence Fees for Home Boarders
Extension of Dog Services Contract
Environmental Protection Update
Capital Programme Monitoring Report
Work Programme and Contracts Register
PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS—1st March 2017
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Budget Monitoring
CCTV Options Report
Gangs Update
Internal Audit CCTV report.
BYC Presentation
SLaM Presentation
Trading Standards Update
Work Programme and Contracts Register
POSSIBLE FUTURE PRESENTATIONS
Impact Factor
London Ambulance Service
POSSIBLE FUTURE VISITS
Victim Support
Impact Factor
CCTV
Police Dogs Passing Out Parade
Bromley Drug and Alcohol Service
Bromley and Croydon Women's Aid

Contracts Register for Contracts Sub Committee 31 January 2017

All contracts valued £200k+ are required to be presented at the Commissioning Board.

Contract and Supplier Name							Dept.	Contract Value		To be completed by Finance only		Contract Term and Extension Options					Commentary
Ref.	ID	Contract Manager	Head of Service/ Assistant Director/ Director Responsible	RAG Status (Assigned by Commissioning & Procurement)	Title	Supplier Name	Dept	Total Contract Value	Original Annual Value	2016/17 Budget	2016/17 Projected	Start Date	End Date (including any extensions taken)	Duration Months (core term + any extensions taken)	Variation/ Extension/ Waiver Option Taken?	Variation/ Extension/ Waiver Information	31 JANUARY 2017 UPDATE An update has been provided for contracts expiring within 1 year
ECHS 48	ecm_38101	Aileen Stamate	Anne Watts		Domestic Abuse - Bromley Domestic Abuse Support Groups	Bromley Women's Aid	ECHS	£92,212	£16,579	£23,629	£23,629	01-Aug-13	31-Mar-17	44			Delays in tender process due to reduction of MOPAC funding. The contract will be awarded in March 2017 and approval will be sought from Care Services PDS to extend existing contracts for 2 months to allow for this.
ECHS 49	ecm_38102	Aileen Stamate	Anne Watts		Domestic Abuse - Safer Bromley Van	Victim Support	ECHS	£102,413	£25,257	£25,713	£25,713	01-Apr-13	31-Mar-17	48			Delays in tender process due to reduction of MOPAC funding. The contract will be awarded in March 2017 and approval will be sought from Care Services PDS to extend existing contracts for 2 months to allow for this.
ECHS 50	ecm_38106	Aileen Stamate	Anne Watts		Domestic Abuse - Advocacy Project	Victim Support	ECHS	£349,285	£116,461	£116,439	£116,439	01-Apr-14	31-Mar-17	36			Delays in tender process due to reduction of MOPAC funding. The contract will be awarded in March 2017 and approval will be sought from Care Services PDS to extend existing contracts for 2 months to allow for this.
ECHS 51	ecm_38682	Aileen Stamate	Anne Watts		Domestic Abuse - Perpetrator Programme	Domestic Violence Intervention Project	ECHS	£85,516	£28,515	£28,507	£28,507	01-Apr-14	31-Mar-17	36			Delays in tender process due to reduction of MOPAC funding. The contract will be awarded in March 2017 and approval will be sought from Care Services PDS to extend existing contracts for 2 months to allow for this.
ECHS 53	ecm_40652	Aileen Stamate	Anne Watts		Domestic Abuse - Schools Programme, Volunteer Manager and Resettlement Officer	Bromley Women's Aid	ECHS	£ 86,570	£ 60,610	£ 60,610	£ 60,610	01-Jun-15	31-Mar-17	21			Delays in tender process due to reduction of MOPAC funding. The contract will be awarded in March 2017 and approval will be sought from Care Services PDS to extend existing contracts for 2 months to allow for this.
ECS 20	ecm_406210	Jim McGowan	Dan Jones		Dog Collection & Transportation	SDK Environmental Ltd	ECS	£ 111,300	£ 63,600	£ 63,600	£63,600	01-Aug-15	30-Apr-17	21			Procurement Strategy for Stray and Abandoned Dogs and Pest Control Services (ES16043 -PP&S PDS 28.09.16) being progressed. Report going to PP&S PDS on 18 January 2017 to request 9 month extension to allow for the process of tendering.
ECS 8	ecm_3546	Jim McGowan	Dan Jones		CCTV Repair and Maintenance	Eurovia Infrastructure Ltd	ECS	£ 214,256	£ 42,852	£ 43,070	£ 43,070	01-Apr-12	31-Mar-18	72	Extension	Further one year extension available to 31/03/19	Both CCTV contracts (also see ECS11 ecm_3545) have been extended to 31 March 2018 (ES16052 - PP&S PDS 28.09.16) and authority has been delegated to ED E&CS to extend for a further year (to 31 March 2019) if required
ECS 11	ecm_3545	Jim McGowan	Dan Jones		CCTV Monitoring	OCS Ltd	ECS	£ 1,263,258	£ 252,652	£ 261,290	£ 261,290	01-Apr-12	31-Mar-18	72	Extension	Further one year extension available to 31/03/19	Both CCTV contracts (also see ECS8 ecm_3546) have been extended to 31 March 2018 (ES16052 - PP&S PDS 28.09.16) and authority has been delegated to ED E&CS to extend for a further year (to 31 March 2019) if required
ECS 31	ecm_40631	Jim McGowan	Dan Jones		Mortuary Contract	PRUH via Kings NHS Foundation	ECS	£ 384,000		£ 130,760	£ 130,760	01-Oct-14	30-Sep-18	48			

This page is left intentionally blank