

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget 2016-17	Saving 2017-18	2018-19	Total	Reduction %	Employees				Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
								Current		Likely FTE Reductions					
								FTE's	Head count	2017/18	2018/19				
4C1	Education Services	<p><b>Education Services;</b> The service within scope relate to services in Education, Employment and Skills including School Improvement, Behaviour Support, Diversity &amp; Cohesion, Educational Psychologists, School Governance, SEN Core for statutory duties and TU facility time. Funding is provided through Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), Education Support Grant (ESG) &amp; High Needs Funding.</p> <p>A significant proportion of the funding for these services is provided through the DSG including high proportions of funding for the School Improvement team (including Governors &amp; data Team) £1.3m, Behaviour &amp; Attendance £426,000, Fischer Family Trust school licenses £33,500, Trade Union Facility Time £415,800, EEMA £94,000.</p> <p>From 2017 part of the DSG element will be removed from the Council and passed directly to schools with what remains to be removed in March 2018.</p> <p>The total amount of DSG funding used to pay for the current services is £2.4m. This is therefore the sum which is at risk for the current services provided. Future decisions by the Bradford Schools Forum, as well as the Governments prescriptions about how funding can and will be used, will affect the scale of the risk.</p> <p>While the resources will stay in the wider education system - and therefore be available to support the Council's wider ambitions for children - the shift from Council to schools will impact on the services the Council provides and the staff who provide them. High Needs funding may be affected by proposed changes to the National Funding formula for schools.</p> <p>Plans are being formulated whereby a more targeted service will be provided for areas such as school improvement. However, the majority of available funding will be utilised to tackle the education safeguarding agenda.</p>	£3.8m	0	0	0	0%	232.00	274	25	10	28	27	<p><b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b></p> <p>No Questions from staff side</p> <p><b>Children's Level 2 - 14.12.16</b></p> <p>ATL asked if the individual budgets could be broken down within this proposal, i.e. figures/budgets for school improvement, etc. It would be helpful to see how many staff are affected from each team.</p> <p>ATL asked if costings has been done for that.</p> <p>ATL raised insurance policies for maternity absence – is that something academies could buy back.</p>	<p><b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b></p> <p>Management indicated that further assessment needed to be undertaken in relation to vacancy figures &amp; FTE's.</p> <p><b>Children's Level 2 - 14.12.16</b></p> <p>Management will provide the breakdown – JK to action. There will be a health warning as all this will need to be looked at within the rules of the DSG and if teams are funded from the DSG may need to look at some creative options. There will be opportunities for traded services, e.g. school improvement as some MATs require same external validation and we are being approached to do this.</p> <p>Management advised they were looking at this.</p> <p>Management would need to check that out.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2017/18	2018/19	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
														<p>NASUWT had met with the SEND Team and understood a group of Headteachers had met to review the Team to see what was needed moving forward. Who are these schools and what will their input be before this is reported back to Schools Forum on the 11 January.</p> <p>NASUWT noted staff concerns that conversations are being had without them.</p> <p>NUT asked why TU facility time was included when there is a successful buy back service. What are the implications.</p> <p>NUT noted that maternity and paternity insurance in part of that pot but is not in the proposal.</p> <p>NUT asked what the implications were.</p> <p>NUT noted that hopefully most will chose to buy back.</p> <p><b><u>Children's Level 2 - 22.12.16</u></b></p> <p>UNISON asked if the breakdown of budgets requested by ATL at the meeting on 14 December was available.</p> <p>UNISON asked if there had been an announcement about the education grant.</p> <p><b><u>Children's Level 2 - 12.01.17</u></b></p> <p>UNISON asked how many teams would be affected by the reduction of the DSG.</p> <p>NAHT noted there were 6 options; 3 which were feasible and 3 which were not. Would it be the case that Schools Forum will make a recommendation and the Council will either agree or not.</p>	<p>Management advised they were looking at two aspects; school access and teaching services and what this will look like moving forward. In the papers to Schools Forum the teaching services paper sought to seek broad views from Headteachers who had a DSP, ARC, in their schools etc. and as a result we will put forward options on what services could look like but this will be tied in with what the funding element will look like. We are looking at other LA's in the North West but it will be the end of January before we are able to have conversations re the methodology and bring proposals to staff side.</p> <p>Management confirmed staff would be part of the process.</p> <p>Management advised this was part of the de-delegated aspect of DSG and within that there are certain aspects which academies take a slice of the funding and TU facility time is in the de-delegated pot of the DSG.</p> <p>Management thought this would be because it would be a straight buy back and does not involve personnel.</p> <p>Management advised this was not clear yet. The pot will become smaller as academies take their slice of the funds.</p> <p><b><u>Children's Level 2 - 22.12.16</u></b></p> <p>Management advised this would be available early in the new year.</p> <p>Management advised that this had been announced today and staff were looking at the implications. In broad terms it was not great news but not as bad as was anticipated. Will be discussed at Schools Forum on 11 January.</p> <p>Management advised it was not known yet. Schools Forum met on 11 January and will meet again on 18 January where proposals will be put forward. These will then give an indication of travel.</p> <p>Management confirmed this. As soon as the recommendations had been worked through this would be brought back to Level 2.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2017/18	2018/19	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
4C2	Education Services	<p><b>Early Years:</b> (proposal relates to reductions in grant funding &amp; not Council base budgets)The services within scope of this budget reduction relates to Early Years services in Education, Employment and Skills. Outcomes for children have been improving for early years in recent years with the highest results so far being achieved in 2016. Funding is provided through DSG, ESG &amp; High needs funding.</p> <p>A significant proportion of the funding for these services is provided through the DSG including a large proportion for the funding for the Play Team (£220,000), Family Information service (£234,000), Pre school Language Development (£44,600) Early Years Team (£155,400).</p> <p>The DSG element of early years is removed in part from the Council in March 2017 and the remaining in March 2018. This is without any other funding cuts amounts to a budget decrease of £654,000 by March 2018.</p> <p>The Council will have to work with others to review all its early years provision. Plans are being formulated to develop a coherent &amp; targeted suite of early years services including early help, family centres &amp; early years services including children's centres.</p>	£9.4m	0	0	0	0%	122.00	153	10	10	8	7	<p><b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b></p> <p>No Questions from staff side</p> <p><b>Children's Level 2 - 12.01.17</b></p> <p>UNISON also had the same question as above about teams affected by the DSG.</p>	<p><b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b></p> <p>Management indicated that further assessment needed to be undertaken in relation to vacancy figures &amp; FTE's.</p> <p>Management noted this and advised this would link in with work with Children's Centres and Early Years services.</p>
4C3	Childrens/Regen	<p><b>A Prepared &amp; Skilled Workforce:</b> This and other savings proposals set out below will see an overall reduction of £2.3 million on 2016-17 budget (including reserve funding) in Education Employment and Skills. Furthermore, there will be a £1.2million reduction in projected income for Skills for Work during the period by 2018 as the Work and Work Choice Programme ends from April 2017 that will have to be factored into the savings required.</p> <p>Key elements of the proposals are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To restructure Skills for Work and reduce staff in line with a reduction in income with the finishing of the government's Work and Work Choice programmes from April 2017.</li> <li>• To reduce the Connexions Contract by £150,000 per annum in 2017-18 and 2018-19.</li> <li>• At the end of the current Connexion Contract in August 2019 re-design the activity and bring the service in-house at a reduced cost.</li> <li>• Explore the feasibility of establishing a regional young person tracking data centre with other West Yorkshire local authorities to make savings.</li> <li>• To make Skills House funded from base budget from April 2020</li> <li>• Cease funding the Employment Opportunity Fund (EOF) from April 2017.</li> </ul>	£2.0m	150,000	150,000	300,000	15%	96.00	122	13.5	12.75	5	0	<p><b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b></p> <p><b>Unite</b> - Getting people into work is a key priority of the Council so how does this proposal support the plan, especially as Bradford has a growing young population?</p> <p><b>ATL</b> - In terms of Connexions staff - they arent Council staff - is there a proposal to transfer in?</p>	<p><b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b></p> <p>Management confirmed Bradford has a good track record of getting people into work &amp; the service is intending to source European funding in light of Council cuts.</p> <p>Management confirmed that this is a real challenge as investment in this area has been very successful previously. However, as the government is moving away from this so the role is changing to one of influencing &amp; trying to ensure other providers do what they should. Funding for Skills House &amp; the Industrial Centre for Excellence will continue.</p> <p>Management were not planning this, but the contract could be looked at with a view to bringing in-house.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2017/18	2018/19	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
4C4	Social Care - Child Protection Teams	<b>Child Protection Management Restructure:</b> This activity area includes the work of the fourteen teams who work in front line Child Protection in the District, the specialist services management team, and the interpreting budget for children in the care system. The proposal is to undertake a review in year 1 to align the Child Protection teams with a revised approach to delivering early help to children and families that includes a range of services to be delivered at a locality level. Currently there are fourteen team leaders in the child protection teams. The proposal is that the number of teams is reduced by four to ten, potentially resulting in a reduction in the number of team managers. This process will be started in year 1 but full savings will not be realised until year 2 due to the requirements for review and consultation. In addition the proposal is to review the overall staffing & non staffing budgets and identify further saving in years 1 and 2 of 2% in each year.	£7.0m	240,000	240,000	480,000	7%	32.00	32	2	2	1	0	<p><b>Corporate Level - 7.12.16</b></p> <p>No questions from staff side</p> <p><b>Children's Level 2 - 14.12.16</b></p> <p>UNISON noted the reduction in teams from 14 to 10. Has this moved further on.</p> <p>UNISON asked if there were any vacancies.</p> <p>UNISON asked how the ration of Managers to Social Workers compared across the region.</p> <p>UNISON noted there had been 2 adverts for an IRO and for a Manager in Fostering and Adoption and asked if it was appropriate to be advertising those posts.</p> <p>UNISON noted there was an agency Team Manager in the Duty Team – are there any other agency Team Managers.</p>	<p><b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b></p> <p><b>Children's Level 2 - 14.12.16</b></p> <p>Management advised this was progressing but would ensure this was safe and appropriate before finalising. There will be no reductions in frontline Social Workers but Team Manager reductions, meaning bigger teams. Work is currently being done on checking numbers and best ratios, including looking at Advanced Practitioners providing support. Once this has been done we will be in position to look at how this will be implemented. Will be a reduction of 4 managers; 2 this year and 2 next year.</p> <p>Management noted there were none but there had been VR requests.</p> <p>Management advised some workload comparators had been done across the region but not ratios of Managers to Social Workers but looking at models.</p> <p>Management advised the Adoption and Fostering post had been an acting arrangements for some time and with the adoption service transferring out we need to ensure management arrangements are in place as this is the team that will be taking forward SGO's – this is an internal advert. There is a need to make sure we have IRO's too so it is appropriate that the adverts continue.</p> <p>Management advised there was an agency Service Manager but no Team Managers. The Chair highlighted the need to get the balance right between managers knowing their children and still running the business as this is such a high risk service.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2017/18	2018/19	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
														<p><b><u>Children's Level 2 - 22.12.16</u></b></p> <p>UNISON appreciated there were ongoing discussions but would like more detail on the ratio of managers to cases. Would like evidence and figures on acceptable number of cases to manage to ensure there is a safe level for client group and staff.</p> <p>UNISON noted that the potential reduction of service managers given that one service manager is leaving.</p> <p>UNISON highlighted the increase in referrals and asked how this would be balanced.</p> <p><b><u>Children's Social Care Level 3 - 05.01.17</u></b></p> <p>UNISON expressed concerns about reducing the number of Social Workers in Contact.</p> <p><b><u>Children's Level 2 - 12.01.17</u></b></p> <p>UNISON noted the number of CIN cases had reduced since June. It would be useful to have the CIN numbers.</p> <p>UNISON raised Families First and payment by results. One observation is that if a case is closed and then after, for example, 3 months it is re-opened the team won't take the case as they would not get paid.</p> <p>UNISON asked if these would all be Families First referrals.</p> <p>UNISON asked about the Early Help clusters following notification of the innovation funds and where this was up to.</p>	<p><b><u>Children's Level 2 - 22.12.16</u></b></p> <p>Management agreed there were variations due to a number of factors and there needed to be a fair process. More detailed information will be available once the review is complete.</p> <p>Management advised this would be part of the discussions as there was a need to ensure there was a safe service.</p> <p>Management advised a review was being undertaken across Early Years and Early Help looking at 0-25 years. This would look at referrals as well as issues such as getting into education.</p> <p><b><u>Children's Social Care Level 3 - 05.01.17</u></b></p> <p>Management confirmed that they were not looking to reduce any Social Workers. Management confirmed that the above was only a proposal at this stage and that Management would be looking further into all the practicalities around this.</p> <p>Management advised that the numbers were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAC – 932</li> <li>• CP – 554</li> <li>• CIN – 1,120.</li> </ul> <p>Management advised that Families First does need to do the work to maximise their income but if a family is not eligible for a service from Families First it doesn't mean they won't get a service under the new Early Help model. SW's will take referred families. Workers will bring their entire caseload with them initially and will then move into localities.</p> <p>Management advised that it doesn't need a Families First worker to access income through the Families First payments. It is about a lead practitioner working with a family to improve outcomes.</p> <p>Management advised they had met with DfE today and agreed to start funding from March 2017. Initially there will be 3 projects; 2 commissioning (fostering and residential services) and 1 around No Wrong Door. Need to recruit staff for the last project so starting funding in March to allow for recruitment.</p>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2017/18	2018/19	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
														UNISON asked if there would be evaluation of the programme.	Management advised the innovation funding had an element of 10% set aside by Government for evaluation. The early intervention should reduce costs in, e.g. health and court costs, so would need to have analysis of this to help with any future bids. A team from the University will also be evaluating how the work translates from North Yorkshire to Bradford given the different demographics.
4C5	Social Care - Management savings	<b>Further Management Savings:</b> Across Children's Social Care, the role of team managers is to oversee cases and support social workers to put in place good plans for children. They are responsible for an outcome area within specialist services. This proposal is that a review is undertaken of the management structure within children's social care, reducing it by two service manager posts and one team manager in addition to team manager reductions identified in other service areas.	£57.0m	85,000	85,000	170,000	0.30%	96.00	96	2	1	1	0	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b>  No questions from staff side	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b>
4C6	Social Care - Early Help	<b>Review Management Structure &amp; commissioned Services;</b> Within the scope of this activity is early help for children and families commissioned from the VCS, Youth Offending Team, crime prevention and the family centres, families first and other early help services offered through children's centres, and for disabled children and young people. The targeted early help portfolio includes a range of statutory, early intervention and prevention services. These seek to help vulnerable families to help themselves, become more resilient and take action early in the life of a problem for children of all ages. Funding comes from a number of sources including the council, Youth Justice Board and Troubled Families Programme. This proposal is to undertake a review of the management structure resulting in the reduction of 1 Team Manager, and a review of the external commissioning budget to achieve a reduction of 15% in year 2. In addition there will an overall review of the service to achieve a 1% budget reduction.	£4.7m	80,000	120,000	200,000	4%	189.00	213	1	0	6	2	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b>  No questions from staff side  <b>Children's Level 2 - 14.12.16</b>  UNISON asked if this programme would still be in place.	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b>  Management advised that it would. The DfE were here 2 weeks ago to do a health check and the programme will continue to 2020 but the funding is reliant on us finding families otherwise we won't receive the attachment fee and we will only draw down the payment by results fee if we do the work.
4C7	Social Care - Looked After Children	<b>Looked After Team:</b> Within the scope of this activity is the Looked After Children's team, young peoples advocacy and the Children in Care Council. This proposal is to undertake a review of overall staffing & non staffing budget and save 1% each year from within the service	£1.9m	19,000	19,000	38,000	2%	34.80	41	0	0	0	0	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b>  No questions from staff side	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b>

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2017/18	2018/19	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
														<b>Children's Level 2 - 14.12.16</b> UNISON asked how the target to reduce the number of LAC was being met.	<b>Children's Level 2 - 14.12.16</b> Management advised that the number of LAC was currently at 924 and under the Journey to Excellence we hoped to reduce by 75 over 2 years (from 2016-2018) as some of those LAC are in expensive placements. This proposal is not around reducing posts but about how we make efficiencies, such as using vacancy management and not agency staff which has reduced the budget by 1%.
4C8	Social Care - Fostering and Adoption	<b>Fostering &amp; Adoption Management Restructure:</b> Within the scope of this activity is the staffing of fostering service; buildings; marketing; fostering fees; foster care assessments and panels; family and friends carer assessments and allowances; fostering fees and allowances; crisis and carer support costs. The change proposed is to review the team manager structure of the service to remove one post in year 2 making a saving of £50,000. This will be achieved through a review of workload and rationalising the current four teams into three.	£17.9m	0	50,000	50,000	0%	10.00	11	0	1	1	2	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b> No questions from staff side	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b>
4C9	Social Care - CCHDT	<b>Disabled Children Team;</b> Within the scope of this activity is the Children's Complex Health and Disabilities team staffing, placement support, inclusion intensive support, Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS), under 18 drugs and alcohol, short breaks, family intervention, trusted adult, shared care and contract carers. The Children with Disabilities Service is made up of two elements. • 3 Residential Units; Clockhouse, Wedgewood and Valley View • 3 Statutory Social Work Teams. This proposal is to build on the review already underway with CAMHS to ensure a service that meets the needs of children moving forward and is delivered within a reduced budget saving £250,000. In addition the proposal is to review the overall staffing & non staffing budget and save £34,000 in Year 2.	£5.2m	250,000	34,000	284,000	5%	22.00	24	1	0	1.5	0	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b> No questions from staff side  <b>Children's Social Care Level 3 - 05.01.17</b> UNISON requested further information in relation to this.  UNISON asked how many people are currently employed within the CAMHS set up?	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b>  <b>Children's Social Care Level 3 - 05.01.17</b> Management confirmed that we commission CAMHS to provide some services or consultancy to support our work with children with mental health needs. We are looking to reduce the £250,000 that we contribute to this.  Management agreed to check with Head of Service (Through Care & Resources) to get confirmation of figures.

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2017/18	2018/19	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
														<p><b>Children's Level 2 - 12.01.17</b></p> <p>UNISON asked about CAMHS and Disability Teams – how many SW's are working in CAMHS and whether they took referrals.</p> <p>UNISON noted that Theresa May had spoken about mental health, the lack of support in schools and of undertaking a review. Would it be better to wait for that review before considering this proposal.</p> <p>UNISON noted that CAMHS were looking to restructure – do we know what's happened with this.</p> <p>UNISON asked if staff knew they would be returning.</p>	<p>Management advised there were 3 SW's. They provide a consultancy service to other SW's, not direct work with families.</p> <p>Management advised this proposal was in place following a local review. Following the speech it was likely that there would be some Government funding coming forward but waiting for that would be risky.</p> <p>Management will seek an update and report back. It would be easy to absorb SW's back into mainstream SW posts and this would reduce agency spend.</p> <p>Management confirmed they did.</p>
4C10	Performance Partnership, Commissioning	<p><b>Child Protection Review Team:</b> The services in scope are the Independent Reviewing Officer and Child Protection Chairs, and the LADO (Local Authority Statutory Officer). These services are all statutory. This proposal is to undertake a review of all staffing &amp; non staffing budgets and achieve a saving of 2% of budget in Year 2. Areas that will be looked at include vacancy management and use of software to reduce administrative requirements. The review will prioritise non staff spending for reduction but there may be a requirement for staff reductions.</p>	£1.2m	0	24,000	24,000	2%	40.00	46	0	0	6	1	<p><b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b></p> <p>No questions from staff side</p>	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b>
4C11	Social Care- Leaving Care Service	<p><b>Leaving Care:</b> Within the scope of this activity is the staffing of the service, university support, Southwark judgement costs, semi independent placements and stepping stone support. This proposal is to review overall staffing &amp; non staffing budgets to achieve a saving of 2% in Year 1 &amp; a further 1% in Year 2. Areas that will be looked at include vacancy management, improved procurement arrangements on items bought for young people, a review of agreements with providers of purchased services and closer monitoring of grants paid to young people to ensure that this is in line with the agreed policy. The review will prioritise non staff spending for reduction but there may be a requirement for staff reductions.</p>	£3.5m	68,000	34,000	102,000	3%	89.00	143	0	0	0	1	<p><b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b></p> <p>No questions from staff side</p>	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b>
4C12	Education Employment & Skills	<p><b>Early Years School Readiness:</b> This project funds a range of small VCS providers to undertake community based activity to help prepare children for school. The budget proposal is to review this funding opportunity from 2017-18 and to make a reduction in the grants offered, ensuring that projects funded in the future meet the criteria of ensuring school readiness in line with the Council priority.</p>	£0.4m	60,000	0	60,000	15%	122.00	153	0	0	4	0	<p><b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b></p> <p>No questions from staff side</p>	<b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b>



Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Total	%	FTE's	Head count	2017/18	2018/19	Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
4C13	Social Care - Drug and Alcohol Team	<b>Drug &amp; Alcohol Team:</b> The Alcohol and Drugs Team is a specialist service tasked to address substance misuse as it affects children, young people and young adults who are parents. This proposal includes a review of the work of the team and all of the other services that support young people with alcohol and drug issues to achieve a saving of £50,000 in year 1 and a further £50,000 in year 2.	£0.3m	50,000	50,000	100,000	29%	15.00	8	2	0	1	2	<p><b>Corporate Level 1 - 7.12.16</b></p> <p><b>Unite</b> - It would be good if management can put some communications out to staff to say what is being done in terms of workforce planning.</p> <p><b>Unite</b> - We expect the use of agency staff to stop. Spending on agency staff should be nil</p> <p><b>Children's Level 2 - 12.01.17</b></p> <p>UNISON asked for more detail on the saving of £50k; how many people were in the team and how many are Management expecting to be in the team.</p> <p>UNISON asked if the team were aware of the reductions.</p> <p>UNISON asked the reason for stopping the FDAC assessments.</p>	<p><b>Corporate Level 1- 7.12.16</b></p> <p>Management confirmed that this proposal will possibly affect 1 or 2 FTEs, therefore the figure of 8 quoted in this proposal needs to be reviewed.</p> <p>Management noted.</p> <p>Management confirmed there has been a reduction in Social Care on agency spend.</p> <p>Management advised there were 8 in the team and proposing a reduction of 1 to 2 staff. The team do FDAC assessments but other work too which will be reviewed and the priority will be statutory work.</p> <p>Management advised staff had been briefed. The courts had also been advised that we were not planning to fund FDAC assessments after April 2017, which is a joint decision with colleagues across the region.</p> <p>Management advised this was for a financial reason.</p>
<b>Total</b>				1,102,827	806,000	1,908,827		1789.40	1,797	59.5	36.75	62.5	40		