

ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE:	Education, Culture and Sport
DATE:	24th March 2011
DIRECTOR:	Annette Bruton
TITLE OF REPORT:	Root and Branch Review of Commissioned Arts and Sports Services
REPORT NUMBER:	ECS/11/011

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report brings before the Committee details of the process developed by Officers in the Education, Culture and Sport directorate which will review arts and sports services commissioned by Aberdeen City Council as part of the Priority Based Budgeting process.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Committee agrees Option 3, on page 18 of the business case, a full strategic review of each commissioned arts and sports service, as the preferred approach, with a five percent cut to all organisations in the first two years in order for the review to be carried out rigorously and according to Best Value requirements. The full Business Case has previously been approved at Council.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The 2010/11 budget for commissioned Culture and Sport services is £9,458,919. This review proposes a framework from which projected budget savings of £1,889,000 will be delivered as part of the Five Year Business Plan.

4. SERVICE & COMMUNITY IMPACT

Service Agreements and business plans will be reviewed using a matrix of criteria designed to mitigate the impact of service reduction to those communities and individuals in greatest need. The review will use existing gathered data, such as the SIMD (Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation) and research commissioned by Creative Scotland and **sportscotland**, to provide robust evidence of need.

It is recognised there is a potential impact from the reduction or withdrawal of these services will have on good relations and community cohesion. Where targeted outreach opportunities are provided by organisations to those who would be significantly adversely affected, consideration of the evident advantages these services provide will be prioritised.

5. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Costs have been built into the review process in order to provide some additional staff capacity: in Year one this is £40,000 and in year two £20,000. The review will be undertaken in tandem with the ECS-C3 decision sheet, proposing a move to a Cultural Trust and the scope the services to be transferred.

A timeline will be agreed with colleagues in Legal and Democratic services in order ensure work is planned in advance and consistency of approach is achieved.

In the first two years a percentage cut is considered appropriate in order for the Council to work with **sportscotland**, Creative Scotland and other local authorities, where partnership funding means the withdrawal or reduction of other grants and the resulting implications are as yet unknown. Internally, the reduction of the Fairer Scotland funding also needs to be considered. The forthcoming Internal Audit report may also outline further implications.

There are no other current Legal, Resource, Personnel, Property, Equipment, Environmental or health and safety implications arising from this report.

6. REPORT

6.1 Description

Due to the required savings identified as part of the Council's Five Year Business Plan there is a requirement to reduce the level of funding provided to commissioned Culture and Sport services. Currently there is no agreed process in place whereby such a review of funding is clearly aligned to the Council's priorities.

Furthermore, there is an inconsistent approach to the monitoring and reporting of commissioned services with varying models in place. This results in a lack of effective and efficient monitoring of the impact of the Council's investment against its priorities. Service and funding agreements are also inconsistent across each commissioned service. This causes a lack of clarity from both parties on what is expected in terms of service delivery against investment. Recent or proposed changes to Following the Public Pound, Freedom of Information, and equalities compliance also require to be integrated into a review.

The core objective of this proposal is to ensure the impact of commissioned services meets the Council's stated priorities. This will present an opportunity for more effective investment helping support services which deliver a quality service aligned to the requirements of the city as a whole. The process will also support the development of consistent and relevant funding and monitoring agreements between the Council and the commissioned service. This will provide clarity to both parties of the expected service delivery, improving both partnership working and the ability to effectively measure the impact of Arts and Sport in the city.

The key stakeholders involved directly with this business case are Aberdeen City Council Officers and Elected Members as well as each commissioned Arts and

Sports organisations. Overall, city residents and visitors are key stakeholders in terms of the end outcomes.

The expected outcome of this proposal is to establish commissioned Culture and Sport services which deliver a better quality, better value service more clearly aligned to the City's requirements.

6.2 Proposal

The proposal is to carry out a strategic review of each commissioned Arts and Sport organisation currently supported by Aberdeen City Council. A dedicated commissioning officer will lead the process, which will involve a detailed review of organisations funded by Aberdeen City Council against stated priorities. Priorities in this context are set out within key policy documents including the Single Outcome Agreement, Education, Culture and Sport Service plan and the Culture and Sport Strategies, 'Vibrant Aberdeen' and 'Fit for the Future'.

Each review will fully analyse key performance indicators and business plans, assessing a range of factors including quality of service, customer satisfaction, vision and aspiration, partnerships; and long term financial sustainability.

The intended outcome, contained within a detailed report to Committee will be a series of budget and development recommendations for future years. These will be considered in the context of any move to a Cultural Trust and presented alongside these options. These recommendations will be based on the ability of the organisation to deliver upon the Council's stated priorities. The report containing all recommendations will be presented to Education, Culture and Sport, who will be asked to make a final decision based upon the detail and Officer recommendations contained within the report.

It is possible that two core funded organisations who currently receive a similar level of funding could enter this process and come out with very different outcomes. One organisation may clearly demonstrate their impact on a range of the City's priorities and receive a recommendation for support which is equal to or even greater than their current level of support, while another could receive a recommendation for a significant reduction or even withdrawal of support. The process may also identify and recommend alternative models of delivery for the service provided.

This proposal, in preference to alternative approaches such as applying an annual fixed percentage reduction to all organisations for the entire length of the business case. However, to review each organisation (upwards of 40 separate bodies) could take up to two years and during such time a fixed percentage reduction would be applied to meet the savings required. This also enables a wider picture to become apparent where other funding partners are involved.

6.2.2 Process Timeline

- **February 2011 – March 2011:** The commissioning process is fully detailed to each relevant commissioned organisation. A delivery plan is established which details the roll out of the process including the projected time-frame for each organisation. Due the number of commissioned

bodies and the staff resource, it is not feasible that each organisation can enter the process at the same time. As such, a policy based upon levels of funding, current service agreements, risk and available staff resource will be established to determine the specific details for delivering the process.

- **April 2011 – March 2013:** The commissioning process will begin and in line with delivery plan, recommendations will be brought before for the appropriate committee to action prior to the 2013/14 financial year. Required budget savings for this period will be met by applying a fixed percentage reduction to each commissioned service.
- **April 2013 – March 2015:** Following a decision by Committee, the recommendations will be implemented including the revised funding and monitoring agreements. A review of the process will evaluate its effectiveness and consider its adoption as standard practice. It is acknowledged that organisations individual circumstances may change through the process and in order to mitigate any unforeseen circumstances dialogue will be ongoing with each body.

6.3 Benefits

A series of potential benefits from adopting this approach have been identified including:

- This process clearly links Statutory Performance Indicators and other performance data to the delivery of strategic objectives and relates these to the funding process.
- Strategic and outcome based commissioning is based on a robust assessment, targeted to deliver on key priorities with a focus on value for money and return on investment.
- Where appropriate, funding can be linked to delivery against specific agreed targets with flexibility to adjust these over time.
- There is benefit in engaging in the commissioning across local authority boundaries. This includes investigating the possibility to jointly commission services.
- Where commissioning is integrated into wider Single Outcome Agreement (SOA) outcomes, the process can encourage cross sector delivery on objectives, consortium bids and greater innovation and choice.
- The process allows for longer term strategic relationships to be developed. The potential for recommending an in principle longer term investment allows for more effective planning, monitoring and service delivery.
- This process will also allow for revised or new funding and service agreements to be established and monitored in line with service delivery and Council priorities.
- Strategic commissioning is a model which will also help address current and future State Aid issues across Art and Sport.

- Establishes an equitable process, whereby each commissioned service is reviewed and recommendations made within an agreed and transparent structure.
- Provides each organisation with details on the process and an anticipated time-scale. This will enable each organisation to be fully prepared and removes aspects of uncertainty.
- Allows Aberdeen City Council to identify whether the existing framework of partners continue to be relevant or can be delivered by alternative means.
- Establishes a holistic approach to each organisation, which considers implications across all funding streams, reduces Council dependency, builds a critical mass and provides a context in which gaps can be identified and addressed,.

6.4 Alternative Options

Below are two alternative options which could be adopted to deliver the anticipated budget reductions. These options have been fully explored with both the benefits and risks identified for each. Having assessed each option, a strategic review has been identified as most effective. The proposed options for a Culture Trust for the City will be considered when strategically reviewing the services Aberdeen City Council commissions.

6.4.1 – Percentage Budget Reduction

This option is to apply a fixed percentage budget reduction to all commissioned Arts and Sport services. The percentage reduction would be annual and be based on the budget saving required for that year. Identified benefits of this process include a level of immediate clarity for commissioned services, who would be aware of budget reductions for a fixed period. Furthermore, this could be delivered on time with the existing reduced staff resource.

The risks with this option are numerous including the potential for an uneven and unqualified impact on commissioned services. This includes the potential for services to cease or dramatically reduce without consideration on the impact that would have upon the City. A further risk is that this approach would not provide a structure to address the current deficiencies within the Council's ability to effectively monitor its investment. This could result in a situation whereby future decisions beyond this business case would not be based on the Council's priorities and more immediately, supported organisations would not be clear on what they are expected to deliver.

This process is likely to impact upon the Council's relationship with the commissioned services. The nature of this change will vary from organisation, with those least impacted by such an approach likely to remain positive. However, organisations are likely to feel aggrieved at any budget reductions imposed without any review or discussion. Similarly, other funders such as **sports**otland and Creative Scotland may not react well to such a rigid approach. As such, there is the potential that it could have an adverse effect on the funding they provide to commissioned services in the city.

6.4.2 - Target Specific Organisations

The second option is to target specific organisations for budget reductions. By looking at the savings required, criteria could be drawn up which would identify particular organisations. These criteria would likely be financial with the level of funding provided and how much this represents in the overall budget, key factors. For example, if the criteria determined the Council would only support 50% of each services specific cost, and then any organisation who receives above this level would be reduced.

There are few identified benefits to this process however it would promote organisations to reduce any reliance on the Council and seek alternative funding sources. Furthermore, it would allow organisations to be aware of any budget reduction and an incremental deployment of this option could allow time to plan ahead.

In terms of risks associated with this option, there are several to be considered. Firstly, any policy would have to align to required budget savings and this would be difficult to achieve. Furthermore, there is no consideration given to the individual circumstances and as such could result in commissioned Arts and Sport bodies being forced to reduce or stop without any consideration to the service they deliver. This option also fails to consider the city's priorities and the Council's responsibility to manage these. Such a rigid approach is viewed as extremely risky and could have a negative impact on the Arts and Sport organisations provided in the city.

7. REPORT AUTHOR DETAILS

Gary Cameron
Culture and Leisure Strategy Officer
gcameron@aberdeencity.gov.uk
01224 522744

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Report to Culture and Leisure Trust shareholder monitoring working group 31
January 2011



Aberdeen City Council

Priority Based Budgeting
Business Case Guide and Outline Template
19 November 2010

Contents

Document Control	3
1. ... Executive Summary	4
1.1 Description	4
1.2 Benefits	4
1.3 Costs	6
1.4 Investment Appraisal	6
1.5 Recommendation	7
1.6 Consequences of not undertaking the project	8
2. ... Background	9
2.1 Current Situation and Business Need	9
2.2 Issue or Opportunity	9
3. ... Description	10
3.1 Objectives	10
3.2 Scope	11
3.3 Out of Scope	11
3.4 Timeline	7
3.5 Outcomes	11
3.6 Stakeholders	12
4. ... Business Need and Strategic Fit	14
4.1 Business Need and Strategic Fit	8
5. ... Risks and Constraints	15
5.1 Risks and Constraints	9
6. ... Options	17
6.1 Option 1 – Percentage Budget Reduction	17
6.2 Option 2 – Target Specific Organisations	18
6.3 Option 3 – Review of Commissioned Culture and Sport Services	18
6.4 Recommended Option	18
7. ... Cost and Benefits Analysis	20
7.1 Cost and Benefits Analysis	20
7.2 Expected Costs	20
7.3 Expected benefits	22
8. ... Investment Appraisal	24
8.1 Note on investment appraisal measures	24
8.2 Note of caution on investment appraisal	25
9. ... Recommendations	26
9.1 Key Recommendations	14
9.2 Assumptions and Dependencies	14
10. Implementation Approach	27
11. Appendices	29

Document Control

Document Owner

Owner	Lesley Thomson / Gary Cameron
-------	-------------------------------

Document Approvals

Name	Signature	Title	Date	Version

Document Distribution

Name	Title	Date	Version

The Business Case guide details the outline structure and key headings for the development of Business Cases

It is intended completed Business Cases should not be more than 12 pages in length and clearly articulate key recommendations with investment costs and benefits and intended savings, key risks and constraints and alternate options.

1. Executive Summary

The Executive Summary should summarise the key aspects of the business case, the objectives and benefits associated with the initiative, along with the consequences of not undertaking the initiative. *Typically this is best presented as a series of bullet points, under the following headings:*

1.1 Description

Summarise the problem or issue underlying the business case, along with the overall objectives of the project related to the business case, the key stakeholders involved, and the expected outcome associated with the work.

- There is a requirement to reduce the level of funding provided to commissioned Culture and Sport services; however no process is in place to allow this reduction to be aligned to the Council's priorities.
- A commissioned Culture and Sport service refers to an external organisation or group who are supported by Aberdeen City Council.
- There is an inconsistent approach to the monitoring and reporting of commissioned services with varying models in place. This results in a lack of effective and efficient monitoring of the impact of the Council's investment against its priorities.
- Service and funding agreements are also inconsistent across each commissioned service with several missing or expired. This causes a lack of clarity from both parties on what is expected in terms of service delivery against investment.
- The core objective of this proposal is to determine the impact of commissioned services against the Council's stated priorities. This will present an opportunity for more effective investment helping support services which deliver a quality service aligned to the requirements of the city as a whole.
- The process will also support the development of consistent and relevant funding and monitoring agreements between the Council and the commissioned service. This will provide clarity to both parties of expected service delivery, improving both partnership working and the ability to effectively measure the impact of Culture and Sport in the city.
- The key stakeholders involved directly with this business case are Aberdeen City Council Officers and Elected Members as well as each commissioned Culture and Sport Service. Overall, city residents and visitors are key stakeholders in terms of the end outcomes.
- The expected outcome of this proposal is to establish commissioned Culture and Sport services which deliver a quality service aligned to the city's requirements.

1.2 Benefits

Define the key benefits (financial and non-financial) supporting the business case.

- The commissioning process clearly links SPI's and other performance data to the delivery of strategic objectives and relates these to the funding process.
- Strategic and outcome based commissioning is based on a robust assessment, targeted to deliver on key priorities with a focus on value for money and return on investment.
- Where appropriate, funding can be linked to delivery against specific agreed targets with flexibility to adjust these over time.
- Reviewing the commissioning process offers opportunities to engage geographical communities and thematic interest groups in the procurement of services, building on Aberdeen's reputation as a city where its residents are meaningfully engaged in the community planning process.
- There is benefit in engaging in the commissioning across local authority boundaries. This includes investigating the possibility to jointly commission services.
- Where commissioning is integrated into wider single outcome agreement (SOA) outcomes, the process can encourage cross sector delivery on objectives, consortium bids and greater innovation and choice.
- The process allows for longer term strategic relationships to be developed. The potential for recommending an in principle longer term investment allows for more effective planning, monitoring and service delivery.
- This process will also allow for revised or new funding and service agreements to be established and monitored in line with service delivery and Council priorities.
- Strategic commissioning is a model which will also help address current state aid issues across Culture and Sport.
- Establishes an equitable process, whereby each commissioned service is reviewed and recommendations made within a set structure.
- Provides each organisation with details on the process and an anticipated time-scale. This allows each organisation to be fully prepared and removes aspects of uncertainty.
- Allows Aberdeen City Council to identify whether the existing framework of partners continue to be relevant or can be delivered by alternative means.
- Establishes a holistic approach to each organization, which considers implications across all funding streams (eg, Creative Scotland), reduces Council dependency, builds a critical mass and a context in which gaps can be identified and addressed,.

1.3 Costs

Key costs over the agreed lifetime of the work product (not just the lifetime of the project). Initial costs should be split between capital and current expenditure over a calendar view (at 'Executive Summary' level, this should be over an annual time period).

£	FY01/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	TOTAL
Revenue Expenditure						
<i>Can add rows to breakdown expenditure, but this is intentionally more summarised than the detail given in the Cost section of the business case</i>	£40,000	£60,000	£70,000	£80,000	£90,000	£90,000
TOTAL (A)						
Capital Expenditure						
<i>Can add rows to breakdown expenditure, but this is intentionally more summarised than the detail given in the Cost section of the business case</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
TOTAL (B)						
TOTAL (A+B)						
Benefits						
One off benefits						
On-going benefits	£104,000	£343,000	£726,000	£1,251,000	£1,889,000	£1,889,000
TOTAL (C)	£104,000	£343,000	£726,000	£1,251,000	£1,889,000	£1,889,000
NET BENEFIT (C-(A+B))						

1.4 Investment Appraisal

Provide an overview of the investment appraisal, with initial financials, including capital/current expenditure, return on investment, and payback. This can be tabulated for ease of presentation as follows:

Measure	Value
<i>Payback (years)</i>	<Time period>
<i>Net Present Value (over [x] years)</i>	<Monetary value>
<i>Internal Rate of Return (IRR)</i>	<% value>
<i>Anything else calculated e.g. gross / net depth of funding</i>	

Document the assumptions used for the investment appraisal e.g.the discount rate used to calculate the NPV and the periods to which the discount rate is applied.

1.5 Recommendation

Document the selected option based on an overall evaluation of the options in terms of impact, risk, and cost/benefit.

Document the key assumptions and dependencies that have been used that will be required for the Business Case to be implemented.

- Carry out a strategic review of each commissioned Culture and Sport service currently supported by Aberdeen City Council.
- Priorities in this context are set out within key policy documents including the Single Outcome Agreement, Education, Culture and Sport Service plan and the Culture and Sport Strategies.
- A specific commissioning officer will lead the process which will involve a detailed review of organisations funded by Aberdeen City Council. This will involve a full review of each organisations business plan as well as an agreed meeting structure.
- The key outcome of this will be the establishment, contained within a detailed report, of a series of budget and development recommendations for future years. These recommendations will be based on the ability of the organisation to deliver upon the Council's stated priorities.
- The report containing all recommendations will be presented to the appropriate Council committee. The committee will be asked to make a final decision based upon the detail and officer recommendations contained within the report.
- As an example of a potential outcome, it is possible that two core funded organisations who currently receive a similar level of funding could enter this process and come out with very different outcomes. One organisation may clearly demonstrate their impact on a range of the city's priorities and receive a recommendation for support which is equal to or even greater than their current level of support, while another could receive a recommendation for a significant reduction or even withdrawal of support.
- This proposal negates alternative approaches such as applying an annual fixed percentage reduction to all organisations for the length of the business case.
- The ability to deliver this process relies entirely on the increased staff resource (one full-time, fixed term post) contained within the business case. The current reduced staff resource would be unable to effectively deliver this process whilst continuing to manage day to day responsibilities.

1.6 Consequences of not undertaking the project

Not undertaking this proposal leaves two main options for implementing any potential budget reductions.

These are to apply a fixed percentage reduction to each of the organisations based on the overall budget reduction required. This would potentially bring the following consequences:

- Each organisation and the funding provided is unique and an annual fixed percentage reduction the length of the business case will impact at varying levels.
- Without undertaking the commissioning process there is no real strategy underpinning budget decisions. This could see organisations who are effectively delivering upon the Council's priorities forced to scale down or stop altogether.
- The opportunity to review and examine in detail the financial and outcome driven outputs of each organisation, identifying additional potential budget savings, would be lost.
- There is a pressing requirement to undertake a review of many organisations Service Level Agreements. Not to do so may open us to legal and other challenge.

The second alternative would be to identify reductions for specific organisations based upon the level of support provided. This approach would target organisations who receive larger levels of funding, in terms of the level of funding and how much this represents in the organisations overall budget.

- One consequence is that any budget reduction would become a figures based exercise with no consideration given to the Council's priorities, the city's residents or the impact of any reduction to each organisation.
- Adopting this approach is not equitable, with organisations likely to question why they could face a budget reduction without any justification beyond the level of funding provided.
- As in the previous option of adopting as percentage cut, the lack of strategic planning could result in organisations being forced to reduce or cease its operations without any prior assessment.
- Both options fail to provide a process which allows for the impact of each service to be assessed in order to develop improved funding agreements and an improved monitoring framework.

Background

The background section should provide an explanation of the current state. Analyse and capture the current state that relates to the challenge that is the subject of the business case. The challenge relates to the problem, opportunity, or background to any regulatory or legal compliance requirements.

2.1 Current Situation and Business Need

Provide a description of the current state with regard to the organisational structures, processes, and technology as it relates to the problem or opportunity.

The current state of the commissioned Culture and Sport services is that there is an inconsistent approach taken to the level of funding provided, the funding agreements in place and the monitoring and reporting carried out. Much of the funding provided is based on historical agreements which vary between organisations. As a result, the level of funding provided is often not closely aligned to service delivery or the Council's priorities. This issue is further exacerbated by an inability to formalise funding agreements on a consistent basis which, in turn, has affected the ability to effectively monitor and report the impact of the commissioned services.

It has been difficult to significantly impact upon the current status with the current staffing numbers. There has been a changing and often incomplete staffing resource. In 2009, a team of five full-time staff members with assigned administrative support was in place however, the team has now reduced to two full-time members of staff with no direct administrative support. Furthermore, as the directorates' organisational structure has changed as a whole, the roles and responsibilities of the team have extended. This has resulted in a paradoxical situation whereby a smaller team has been required to deliver across a much wider remit.

In summary, the overriding issue is that a reactive approach has prevailed, due to a reducing staff resource which has coincided with an increasing amount of duties. This has led to a minimal structure, whereby the Council's ability to effectively allocate and monitor funding against its priorities has been severely affected, with limited opportunity to take a long term approach.

2.2 Issue or Opportunity

Capture and document the current state of the service and problem or opportunity that the business case seeks to address. Outline the major changes within the organisation, for example detail the underlying reasons resulting in the current situation and the resulting problems or missed opportunities if the current situation is maintained.

This business case creates a structure which represents an opportunity to improve on the current situation. Crucially, the proposal to formalise the process from which funding is allocated to commissioned services allows for historical agreements to be reviewed and for funding to be based on the Council's priorities. This structure, coupled with plans to develop funding agreement and monitoring templates, is also an important step in ensuring a consistent and manageable monitoring framework for all commissioned Culture and Sport services.

Furthermore, the process also provides an opportunity to more effectively utilise the staffing resource available. The business case presents a proposal to create, on a fixed term basis, a specific post which will have the responsibility of leading this process. This will provide a focus, allowing for this work to take priority and any additional requirements to be handled by the existing team.

3. Description

Document the areas of impact and boundaries of the project. This section outlines the detailed objectives, scope, expected outcomes, and key stakeholders involved with the project. It explains how to address the identified problems or opportunities.

3.1 Objectives

Provide a clear measurable statement of what the project will accomplish.

Project objectives can relate to the time, cost, and operational objectives or relate more to how the objectives are achieved e.g. reduce costs, improve customer satisfaction.

The process will create a structure whereby the allocation and management of funding provided to Culture and Sport services will be based on the ability to impact on the Council's priorities. This impact will be more effectively monitored and presented, helping evidence the crucial role of Culture and Sport in the city.

The project has a range of both specific operational objectives and wider strategic objectives.

Operational

- Develops a process which will improve the ability of the Council to effectively monitor and report the impact of its investment against its stated priorities.
- Provides a focus which will allow for the reduced staff resource to operate more effectively.
- Establishes improved partnership working with all commissioned Culture and Sport services.
- Provides a level of knowledge and understanding which allows the Council to allocate funding based upon its priorities.
- Creates a process which supports and develops the commissioned Culture and Sport services.
- A structure is put in place which has a lasting impact on the Council's approach to its role in supporting and developing commissioned Culture and Sport services.
- The process facilitates the establishment of revised or new funding agreements aligned to service delivery against priorities.

Strategic

- Supports the successful delivery of key strategic objectives. This includes the Single Outcome agreement, Cultural Strategy and the Education, Culture and Sport service plan.
- Helps establish a stronger Culture and Sport infrastructure throughout the City.
- To embed good practice in commissioning within the directorate, which can be implemented more widely.

3.2 Scope

Provide project scope details such as timeline, Directorates and Services involved in the project, Council functions affected and the systems or technology environment it affects.

- The process, as detailed within this business case, will take place across a five year period. However, it is anticipated that, if successful, the process would be adopted on a permanent basis.
- During the two financial years between 2011 and 2013, the review process will be implemented but results will not impact upon budgets until the following year.
- It is projected that any budget savings required in the 2011/12 and 2012/13 financial years will be met through a combination of natural reductions and a percentage reduction to all commissioned services.
- Education, Culture and Sport (E, C & S) will lead on the delivery of the process however will require working with other directorates, in particular Corporate Governance. More specifically, the process will be led by officers from within the Strategy and Policy function of E, C & S with support or advice from other officers when required.

3.3 Out of Scope

Define any key areas that may be viewed as associated with the project, but which management feels should be excluded from scope.

- Organisations who receive Culture or Sport Grants below a particular funding threshold will not formally enter this full review process. Due to the number of grants provided and the often fixed term nature of projects, it is not viewed as feasible or relevant to do so. Instead, a review of the Culture and Sport grants has created a process which adopts the principles contained within this business case and employs them in a more manageable and appropriate way. This includes, revised criteria based on priorities, improved application forms and monitoring templates, additional support made available to organisations and a streamlined application process.

3.4 Timeline

Detail the key phases and milestones for the project, set out an outline implementation plan.

- **February 2011 – March 2011:** The commissioning process is fully detailed to each relevant commissioned service. A delivery plan is established which details the roll out of the process including the projected time-frame for each organisation. Due the number of commissioned services and the reduced staff resource, it is not feasible that each organisation can enter the process at the same time. As such, a policy based upon levels of funding, current service agreements, risk and available staff resource will be established to determine the specific details of delivering the process.
- **April 2011 – March 2013:** The commissioning process will begin and in line with delivery plan. Recommendations will be brought before for the appropriate committee to action prior to the 2013/14 financial year. Required budget savings for this period will be met by applying a fixed percentage reduction to each commissioned service.

- **April 2013 – March 2016:** Following a decision by Committee, the recommendations will be implemented including the revised funding and monitoring agreements. A review of the actual process will to evaluate its effectiveness and consider its adoption as standard practice.

3.5 Outcomes

Describe the outcomes of the project for each component of “SMART” i.e., Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time specific.

Specific:

- A structure which allows for investment to be clearly aligned to priorities will be created.

Measurable:

- The required budget savings will be delivered.
- Each commissioned service will have a new or revised funding and monitoring agreement.

Achievable:

- The overall impact of budget reductions has minimal impact on identified priorities.

Realistic:

- The ability to effectively deliver this process within the time-frame requires an additional staff resource.
- This process may not have a positive outcome for each of the commissioned services currently supported.

Time specific:

- The review and recommendation process will be complete by March 2013.
- Agreed decisions will be fully implemented and monitored by March 2016.

3.6 Stakeholders

Document any key interested parties e.g. customers, Members, private sector providers, affected or are required to achieve the goals of the project.

- **Media:** It is anticipated that the local media may have an interest in particular aspects of the business case. Considering commercial sensitivity, no information on the process will be publically released. The nature of the commissioning reports also means that they are likely to be put forward as confidential within the committee process.
- **Culture and Sport Organisations:** Even if an organisation is not involved in this process it is likely they will be interested. There is strong links between organisations in the sector with many running partnership projects. It is the responsibility of any involved external organisation to determine any external communication in regards to specific details of their involvement in the process
- **Residents/Visitors:** The outcomes of the process are likely to be of interest to particular residents and visitors. If an organisation is taken through the process and comes out with a negative result, there could be a reaction from staff and customers relating to that organisation. Despite the requirement for confidentiality and the requirement for each organisation to determine how it would like to communicate with its groups, it is likely that Aberdeen City Council will have to consider how it handles such occasions.

Document project stakeholders at a high level and outline a plan for communications on the business case.

- **Elected members:** There will be two formal methods of communication with elected members in this business case. Reports with recommendations will be brought before the appropriate Council committee for consideration. Furthermore, the Culture and Leisure Trust Monitoring Working Group will, in line with an agreed structure, act as the monitoring group for the process. Officers will be required to provide the monitoring group with reports detailing progress on agreed priorities. It is also anticipated that officers will have a consistent dialogue out with any formal setting.
- **Senior Management:** Senior management will be kept updated on progress in line with existing team meeting structures. The service manager and, where relevant, the commissioning officer will be responsible for ensuring information is provided to senior management.
- **National Governing Bodies:** A continual dialogue will be maintained with national governing bodies over progress and specific detail relating to the business case. The main bodies will be Creative Scotland and Sportscotland however several organisations sit elsewhere. This will be structured around a series of formal meetings with officers from both parties. The commissioned services are often part-funded by national governing bodies and as such a strong line of communication is crucial in effectively delivering this business case.

4. Business Need and Strategic Fit

4.1 Business Need and Strategic Fit

In this section you need to:

- Explain why the project objectives are required, including a description of the business need and why it is needed
- Relate the change to the Council's strategic objectives
- Comment on the impact of not undertaking the project e.g. what are the consequences of not undertaking the initiative
- Explain how the project aligns with the overall Council objectives e.g. six priorities of the organisation and how it may impact other Council initiatives

The project objectives are required to successfully deliver any necessary budget reductions without adversely affecting the quality of service provided by commissioned Culture and Sport services. There is a real need, as without a process which is aligned to delivering upon the city's priorities, any budget reductions could have a seriously detrimental impact on the Culture and Sport sector in the city.

Creating a structure which allows the Council to allocate funding, based upon successfully meeting its strategic objectives, is the principle driver for this change. Policy drivers such as the Single Outcome Agreement, the Cultural Strategy, the Learning Strategy and the Education, Culture and Sport Service Plan will be the basis for the process, with recommendations developed based on the level of impact against these priorities. Culture and Sport plays a pivotal role in delivering upon a range of the City's priorities and this is often overlooked. This process will take a much wider approach, looking at the role commissioned services play in key areas such as improving health, the economy, changing demographics and "closing the gap". Within this, the process will look at specific Culture and Sport objectives including increasing participation across the City. Organisations who clearly deliver against these priorities and strategic objectives could benefit from this process. However any organisation which does not may well see a budget reduction or withdrawal recommendation put forward.

Failure to adopt a strategic approach to delivering any required budget savings could have serious consequences. It is possible that organisations who deliver a quality service which delivers upon the city's needs could cease to exist or seriously reduce service while an organisation who do not, continue to operate. Additionally, it could be perceived that Aberdeen City Council is not considering its investment in line with its priorities and the city's requirements. Ultimately, this could result in an uneven or lower quality of Culture and Sport services which do not fully meeting the requirements of the City or its residents.

5. Risks and Constraints

It is important to distinguish between risks that are inherent in the process of undertaking a project, and risks associated with project failure.

In this section of the business case you need to understand the risks associated with the project so that they may be considered when selecting the best option.

The Business Case owner should determine a response to each risk based on the priority assigned to the risk, its nature, and the resources available to manage the risk.

By defining risks in the business case, measures can be put in place to minimise the chances of future problems. This section documents the risks that are related to the project and management's risk mitigation strategy for each risk identified. The identified risks will be tracked, monitored and escalated where necessary throughout the project as part of an ongoing risk log.

For example, the project may result in significant change to operational processes, staff roles and responsibilities and some staff changes.

5.1 Risks and Constraints

ID	Description	Status	Directorate	Date Identified	Impact (High, Medium, Low)	Probability (High, Medium, Low)	Owner	Mitigation
1	Natural loss of services negates any need for budget reductions	Ongoing	Education, Culture & Sport		Medium	Low		The process should still be undertaken to align funding with priorities
2	Council Committees do not accept officers recommendations	Ongoing	Education, Culture & Sport		High	Medium		C& L Trust Group fully briefed and aware of recommendations. Default position of % reduction applied.
3	Staff Resource is not sufficient to deliver process	Ongoing	Education, Culture & Sport		Medium	Medium		Work plan drawn up and regularly reviewed. Flexibility and contingency included within plan.

4	Process cannot be completed within scheduled time periods	Ongoing	Education, Culture & Sport		Medium	Low		Work plan has flexibility and contingency
5	Other work responsibilities affect process	Ongoing	Education, Culture & Sport		Medium	Low		Specific commissioning role has clear roles and responsibilities
6	Failure to communicate process internally and externally	Ongoing	Education, Culture & Sport		Medium	Low		Various briefings, meetings and information paperwork. C&L Working group. Regular internal and external meetings
7	Other funding bodies significantly reduce support to commissioned services	Ongoing	Education, Culture & Sport		High	Medium		Regular and structured communication with other funding providers. Financial context integral to process.

6. Options

Present the options available to address organisational challenges and articulate the rationale for why some options address the problem or opportunity better than others.

Provide an overview of the options considered to deliver the required objectives. The inclusion of an option of 'Do Nothing' i.e. do not deliver the desired outcomes, can also be a useful tool in emphasising the compelling need for change, as considerable costs can be associated with this option e.g. loss of market share, fine for non-compliance. Consider which options are aggressive, and which options are conservative.

You need to:

- Capture and document possible alternatives to address the business need. Options must be derived by reviewing and analysing the client's internal and external business environment, use of professional experience, and service specific methodology
- Select viable options – document the reason for excluding alternatives
- Analyse remaining options (viable alternatives) including feasibility, risks, benefits and costs. This should consider options to access funding or partnering with private or public sector organisations to reduce the burden and cost to the Council
- Detail who the options have been considered by e.g. the project sponsor, chief officer, project manager
- A summary cost / benefit review of the options. This should include cultural impacts as well as pure financial ones
- Identify and document critical success factors and constraints for each option

6.1 Option 1 – Percentage Budget Reduction

This option is to apply a fixed percentage budget reduction to all commissioned Culture and Sport services. The percentage reduction would be annual and be based on the budget saving required for that year. Identified benefits of this process include a level of immediate clarity for commissioned services, who would be aware of budget reductions for a fixed period. Furthermore, this could be delivered on time with the existing reduced staff resource.

The risks with this option are numerous including the potential for an uneven and unqualified impact on commissioned services. This includes the potential for services to cease or dramatically reduce without consideration on the impact that would have upon the City. A further risk is that this approach would not provide a structure to address the current deficiencies within the Council's ability to effectively monitor its investment. This could result in a situation whereby future decisions beyond this business case would not be based on the Council's priorities and more immediately, supported organisations would not be clear on what they are expected to deliver.

This process is likely to impact upon the Council's relationship with the commissioned services. The nature of this change will vary from organisation, with those least impacted by such an approach likely to remain positive. However, organisations are likely to feel aggrieved at any budget reductions imposed

without any review or discussion. Similarly, other funders such as Sport Scotland and Creative Scotland may not react well to such a rigid approach. As such, there is the potential that it could have an adverse effect on the funding they provide to commissioned services in the city.

6.2 Option 2 – Target Specific Organisations

The second option is to target specific organisations for budget reductions. By looking at the savings required, criteria could be drawn up which would identify particular organisations. These criteria would likely be financial with the level of funding provided and how much this represents in the overall budget likely to be key factors. For example, if the criteria determined the Council would only support 50% of each services specific costs, then any organisation who receives above this level would be reduced.

There are few identified benefits to this process however it would promote organisations to reduce any reliance on the Council and seek alternative funding sources. Furthermore, it would allow organisations to be aware of any budget reduction and an incremental deployment of this option could allow time to plan ahead.

In terms of risks associated with this option, there are several to be considered. Firstly, any policy would have to align to required budget savings and this would be difficult to achieve. Furthermore, there is no consideration given to the individual circumstances and as such could result in commissioned Culture and Sport services being forced to reduce or stop without any consideration to the service they deliver. This option also fails to consider the city's priorities and the Council's responsibility to use funding to meet these. Such an aggressive and rigid approach is viewed as extremely risky and could have a negative impact on the Culture and Sport services provided in the city.

This option could be delivered with the existing staff reduced resource with no additional cost.

6.3 Option 3 – Review of Commissioned Culture and Sport Services

The final option is to carry out a strategic review of each commissioned Culture and Sport service. This review, in essence, would provide a process from which funding allocation would be aligned to the City's priorities. Each commissioned service would be reviewed to assess their impact against key priorities as presented in policy drivers such as the Single Outcome Agreement, the Cultural and Sporting Strategies and the Education, Culture and Sport service plan.

The key outcome of this would be the establishment, contained within a detailed report, of a series of budget and development recommendations for future years. These recommendations would be based on the ability of the organisation to deliver upon the Council's stated priorities and to evidence its financial sustainability. The committee would be asked to make a final decision based upon the detail contained with the report and officer recommendations. As an example of a potential outcome, it is possible that two core funded organisations who currently receive a similar level of funding could enter this process and come out with very different outcomes. One organisation may clearly demonstrate their impact on a range of the city's priorities and receive a recommendation for support which is equal to or even greater than their current level of support, while another could receive a recommendation for a significant reduction or even withdrawal of support. The process may also identify and recommend alternative modes of delivery for the service provided. To review each organisation could take up to two years and as such a fixed percentage reduction would be applied to meet any savings required during this period.

The identified benefits of this option include the opportunity to carry out a robust assessment, targeted to deliver on key priorities with a focus on value for money and return on investment. Furthermore, a strategic approach provides equality with each organisation entering the same process and thus provided with the same opportunity to evidence its impact. This process also allows the Council to tackle issues around governance and monitoring, creating a structure which will significantly improve its ability to monitor and report the impact of its investment against its priorities.

The risks associated with this option centre around the ability to deliver the process successfully. As the current staff team is significantly reduced, an additional fixed term post is required to lead the process. While it is projected that this resource will be sufficient to deliver the process on time, support will be required from other officers within the Council. A further risk, which also resides within all other options, is the role of other funding providers. Should another funding body reduce or withdraw its funding to a commissioned service then the recommendation for financial support provided by the Council could be impacted. For example, a commissioned service may be forced to reduce or cease to provide a service which has also been supported by Aberdeen City Council. This remains a risk; however the process itself has been identified as having a range of benefits beyond providing recommendations for funding allocation.

6.4 Recommended Option

The recommended option is to review all commissioned Culture and Sport services. Following review of each option by chief officers, it became clear that this was the most effective model for making required budget savings while supporting a range of quality services which deliver upon the city's priorities.

The alternative options were assessed to carry a greater number of risks. In particular, the adoption of a process, whereby budget reductions are not considered strategically, is unlikely to deliver best value. Furthermore, while the proposed review requires an additional fixed term staff resource, unlike the other available options it creates a structure which will provide long-term benefits. The review option focuses on aligning investment to the Council's priorities and ensuring best value and the process developed can be applied for future years. It has been identified that the other options fail to provide this focus, offering a continuation of current practice whereby investment is often linked to historical agreements and the monitoring of its impact both incomplete and inconsistent.

7. Cost and Benefits Analysis

The purpose of this section is to identify, evaluate and document the costs and benefits associated with each viable option identified. The Cost and Benefit Analysis helps to understand and compare the initial and on-going expenditures to the expected financial and non-financial benefits, for each viable option.

Cost benefit analysis is used widely for planning, decision support and project evaluations. In this context of a business case, the terms “cost” and “benefit” do not have a precise definition beyond the implication that both negative and positive impacts are to be assessed and weighed against each other.

The first step in the cost benefit analysis process involves an investigation and assessment of the problem, its context, and background. In reviewing costs for your preferred option, you should also examine the cost of alternatives, including the base case or “do nothing” alternative to provide a baseline for comparative purposes.

7.1 Cost and Benefits Analysis

Perform cost and benefit analysis where all costs and expected benefits resulting from this opportunity should be analysed for each viable alternative including the costs and benefits of status quo. Define the project timescale over which the analysis will be performed; this should cover the planned project lifecycle.

7.2 Expected Costs

This is an estimate of the resources and capabilities (people, physical resources, and funding) needed to deliver the project and sustain the benefits. The estimates need to cover both the direct project costs and the ongoing (business as usual) costs for the lifetime over which the benefits are to be considered.

Costs should include all internal and external costs over the lifetime of the benefit realisation. Make sure that all costs carried by the organisation are included, in particular remembering that benefits in one part of the organisation may result in costs elsewhere in the delivery chain, and the non-direct project costs. Costs should be separated into capital and current expenditure.

Costs can be shown in a number of ways, from a simple table to a complex spreadsheet. The business case should contain an overview and any additional detail from the financial model should be included in the appendices.

The appropriate cost areas to consider will vary depending on the type of project. Immediate project costs are straightforward to identify. However, indirect costs will require further effort. Always consider what activities are impacted by the delivery of the programme or project and how any work products will be sustained e.g. ongoing support and maintenance costs. The benefits identified can be a good starting point for identifying costs that are often overlooked.

For each alternative, a list of costs should be drawn up. These may include costs such as:

- Capital expenditure e.g. acquisition costs of equipment, support equipment
- Operating and maintenance costs for the entire expected economic life of the project, e.g. computer processing time, network charges, space allocation, lease or rental of specific equipment
- Labour costs for the life cycle of the project, e.g. salaries and direct non-wage costs (training, supplies, travel)

- Costs of outputs
- Start-up costs e.g. disruption of business processes due to the conversion to the new business process, extra work hours required to compensate for lower productivity in the start up phase
- Costs of reorganisation toward the business process e.g. redesigning a job, hiring or reassigning people, developing new policies, developing and deploying new systems, consider opportunity cost of not doing
- Research, design and development costs.

Option 1 – Percentage Budget Reduction

Labour costs: This status quo option requires no additional staffing resource to deliver. Any further reduction in staff would mean that this option could not be delivered. Current salary costs attributed to this business case are therefore none in addition to current staffing.

This option incurs no additional capital expenditure or increased operating, maintenance, start-up, reorganisation or research costs.

Option 2 – Target Specific Organisations

Labour costs: This alternative option, again, requires no additional staffing resource to deliver. Similarly, any further reduction in staff would mean that this option could not be delivered. Current salary costs attributed to this business case are therefore none in addition to current staffing

This option incurs no additional capital expenditure or increased operating, maintenance, start-up, reorganisation or research costs.

Option 3 – Review of Commissioned Culture and Sport Services

Labour costs: This option requires an additional, fixed term, post in order to be delivered. This post should not exceed a two year period. When matched with the existing staff resource this results in the following overall labour costs: 2011/12 £40,000; 2012/13 £20,000, 2013/14 £10,000 and 2014/15 £10,000.

7.3 Expected benefits

All benefits identified must be measurable, and expressed clearly against the current situation. Ideally, this will be in financial terms, but non-financial benefits can be included providing they can be measured, e.g. customer satisfaction rating. Any assumptions made in quantifying or delivering the benefit must be stated. A timescale and owner should also be identified for each benefit.

Benefits may be classified as:

1. Financial
2. Non financial – Quantitative e.g. output, efficiency
3. Non financial – Qualitative e.g. customer satisfaction, Members, staff, performance or compliance

A list of the benefits that are expected to flow from the proposed project should also be compiled. For example:

- The value of the output as reflected in revenues generated directly or indirectly through a particular project
- Avoided costs, e.g. costs that would have been incurred in the 'do nothing' situation
- Productivity savings, e.g. reductions in existing levels of expenditure which can be shown to result from the project of program.

Option 1 – Percentage Budget Reduction

- **Financial:**

Contribution to trusts is reduced by 20% over 5 years

No additional staff resource required

- **Operational:** None identified
- **Customer:** None identified
- **Staff members:** None identified
- **External Stakeholder:**

Clarity provided on the projected level of budget reductions for the period.

Option 2 – Target Specific Organisations

- **Financial:**

Contribution to trusts is reduced by 20% over 5 years

No additional staff resource required

- **Operational:** None identified
- **Customer:** None identified
- **Staff members:** None identified
- **External Stakeholder:** None identified

Option 3 – Review of Commissioned Culture and Sport Services

- **Financial:**

Contribution to trusts is reduced by 20% over 5 years

- **Operational:**

Increased capacity to address operational deficiencies.

Consistent and effective reporting and monitoring agreements put in place.

- **Customer:**

Funding is aligned to the city's priorities.

- **Staff members:**

Provides a focus which allows for previously neglected responsibilities to be undertaken by existing staff resource.

- **External Stakeholder:**

Each organisation will be provided with an equal opportunity to demonstrate its impact.

Fixed reduction provides clarity for a two year period.

8. Investment Appraisal

An investment appraisal will be required on most projects. This is a financial analysis of the costs and benefits of the project, and forms an important part of the investment decision. The core information required is as follows:

Measure	
Payback	<Time period>
Net Present Value (NPV)	<Monetary value>
Internal Rate of Return (IRR)	<% value>
Anything else calculated e.g. gross / net depth of funding	

Consider the cost of capital (discount factor) used and the timeframe to deliver e.g. three or five years

This can also be accompanied with other information, such as cash flow analyses and the net / gross depth of funding required in any year of the project.

8.1 Note on investment appraisal measures

All the investment aspects should be considered and you may also have specific guidelines to work from e.g. have to realise savings in years 1&2 and PBB will not look at projects with a payback greater than two years.

- The payback period is defined as the length of time taken to repay the initial project cost. Generally, a long payback period may reduce the willingness to invest in a project. This is a basic measure and will provide a more simplistic view on complex projects, especially where the cost profile is irregular or ongoing costs are high. Beware of any payback calculations that do not take into account the time value of money.
- The Net Present Value (NPV) illustrates the balance between the costs against the financial value of the benefits over a period of time. If the NPV is greater than zero, then there is a net financial benefit to undertaking the project, and therefore the project is viable. This will not mean all projects with a positive NPV will be undertaken; factors such as resource constraints and alignment with organisational strategic objectives are key. In addition, a project with a negative NPV may still be undertaken if there are compelling business reasons to do so e.g. regulatory requirement. NPV is a monetary value, so it can be difficult to compare projects of different sizes by NPV alone.
- The Internal Rate of Return (IRR) is the discount rate that results in a NPV of zero for a series of future cash flows. This is expressed as a percentage and a viable project will have an IRR greater than the cost of capital for the organisation.

Sometimes, the internal rate of return i.e. the discount rate that results in NPV of zero for a series of future cash flows, is preferred to the NPV as it is expressed as a percentage rather than a monetary value.

8.2 Note of caution on investment appraisal

The investment appraisal should be carried out by someone with the appropriate expertise in financial analysis and ideally a qualified accountant at the Council. Although the investment appraisal template can be completed by all users, there are aspects which require additional experience, such as the treatment of capital expenditure and any other accounting policies to adhere to when developing the appraisal. In addition, any client standards regarding cost of capital (discount factor) and timeframes allowed for appraisals need to be considered.

9. Recommendations

This section documents the selected option based on an overall evaluation of the options in terms of impact, risk, and cost/benefit. It also provides recommendations on proceeding with the project.

Based on the analysis performed, a recommended option would be advised, including scope and timescale.

9.1 Key Recommendations

Document the selected option based on an overall evaluation of the options in terms of impact, risk, and cost/benefit.

- Carry out a strategic review of each commissioned Culture and Sport service currently supported by Aberdeen City Council.
- Appoint, on a fixed term basis, a commissioning officer to lead the process.
- Finalise a process and delivery plan which will fully review the Culture and Sport services which are supported by Aberdeen City Council. This should include a full review of each organisations business plan as well as an agreed meeting structure.
- The key outcome of this should be the establishment, contained within a detailed report, of a series of budget and development recommendations for future years. These recommendations should be based on the ability of the organisation to deliver upon the Council's stated priorities.
- The report with recommendations should be presented to the appropriate Council committee. The committee should be asked to make a final decision based upon the detail contained with the report and officer recommendations.
- Potential outcomes of this process should include recommendations which are linked to the service and level of funding provided. This includes the option to recommend funding increases, reductions and withdrawal as well as potential alternative delivery models.

9.2 Assumptions and Dependencies

Document the key assumptions and dependencies that have been used that will be required for the Business Case to be implemented

- The appointment of a fixed term post to lead the process is a key dependency. Considering the staff resource associated with this work has significantly reduced in the last two years, this process cannot be delivered without this additional post.
- Elements of this process also assume that external forces do not significantly impact upon the relevant Culture and Sport services. For example, should another funding provider withdraw or significantly reduced funding to a commissioned service, then this could impact on the review and the subsequent recommendations.

• Implementation Approach

In this section, document the project implementation approach, which includes:

- Project governance structure (Project Roles and Responsibilities)

The project will be led by a specific commissioning officer who will have responsibility for developing and leading the review process. Within this, the commissioning officer will have a responsibility to deliver particular elements of the review process while also coordinating support from other officers across the Council. In particular, the Quality Assurance officer with the Education, Culture and Sports Policy and Performance team will have a remit to support relevant areas of research. Similarly, the Culture and Sport Strategy Officer may be required to deliver aspects of the process which cross over into their particular areas of responsibility. The commissioning officer will also have a responsibility to ensure appropriate colleagues from within other directorates are available to provide specialised support or advice where required.

The commissioning officer will report directly to the Service Manager for Culture and Sport. The Culture and Leisure Trust Monitoring Working Group will oversee the development of the process. While formal recommendations will be brought before a Council committee, this group will receive regular update reports. This allows members of the group to be updated, ask questions and ultimately become actively involved in the process as it is delivered.

- Project implementation phases
- The milestone plan and outcomes including the dates to accomplish

Preparation: February 2011 – March 2011

Following confirmation of budget decisions, the first step will be to call meetings of our Culture and Sport partners. Dates have been provisionally set for February and the aim of each session will be to detail the process, outlining what will be expected from each partner and also projected timescales. These meetings will also set out the financial context and present the rationale for adopting such an approach. Furthermore, each meeting will detail the changes that are being made to both the Cultural and Sporting grant schemes as part of this process.

Also within this period, the strategic commissioning process will be further developed in order to identify and agree a delivery plan. This delivery plan will detail time-scales for each organisation, with factors including the level of funding, current agreement (or lack of) and overall organisational risk considered in its conception. The delivery plan will also consider the identified risks and will contain an element of flexibility as well as contingency plans. Once the plan has been finalised, it will be shared with each organisation and the Culture and Leisure Trust Monitoring Working Group.

Review Process: April 1st 2011 – March 31st 2013

The preferred option cannot be implemented prior to the beginning of the 2012/13 financial year and as such an alternative approach will be adopted towards funding allocation for this period. Based upon the savings required for each financial year, officers will use alternative means to meet this target. This will include a fixed percentage reduction in funding, dependant on legal agreements and external factors such as organisations or projects coming to a natural conclusion.

By the beginning of this period, the delivery plan will be established and officers will begin process with identified organisations. The time required to deliver the process will vary dependant on the organisation and the service provided. In terms of balancing risk and treating each service equitably, the

recommendations from each review will be contained with one report presented to the appropriate committee.

Recommendations: April 1st 2013 – March 31st 2016

In line with the five year business plan and as presented in the delivery plan, the process will be undertaken on an annual basis.

Review: Ongoing – April 1st - March

Throughout the time-scale proposed to deliver this business case, its effectiveness will be assessed

- Expected costs and resources

To deliver this process an additional fixed term post will be required. This post will lead the delivery of the review aspect and should not exceed a two year period. Following this period, a structure will have been created which would allow the existing reduced staff resource to operate more effectively and efficiently.

The anticipated cost of this additional resource in year one is £40,000. In year two it is £20,000.

11. Appendices

The information in the business case is likely to be supported by considerable data collection and analysis. Where it is useful to share this with the business case audience, it should be included as appendices.