



Grant Thornton

An instinct for growth™

Statutory Recommendations

Final Report

March 2019

Birmingham City Council

Audit of Accounts 2018/19

Governance Issues

Birmingham City Council: Statutory Recommendations March 2019

Our responsibilities

1. As well as our responsibilities to give an opinion on the financial statements and assess the arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the Council's use of resources, we have additional powers and duties under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 ('The Act'). These include powers to issue a public interest report, make statutory recommendations and to apply to the Court for a declaration that an item of account is contrary to law. Electors also have the right the opportunity to raise questions about the Council's accounts and to make objections in relation to the accounts.
2. We have concluded that it is appropriate for us to use our powers to make statutory recommendations under section 24 of The Act (Schedule 7) due to the Council's financial and governance challenges.

Reasons for making the recommendation

3. We included statutory recommendations in July 2018 under paragraph 2 of Schedule of 'the Act' in both our 2017/18 Annual Audit Letter and Audit Findings Report relating to operational arrangements, finance and governance. This followed the issue of a statutory recommendation in October 2016 in respect of financial resilience. The statutory recommendations issued in July 2018 stated that the Council needed to:

Finance

- deliver its savings plans in 2018/19, in particular by identifying alternatives where existing plans are not deliverable, to mitigate the impact of the combined savings and budget pressure risks
- develop a realistic medium term financial plan for 2018/19 to 2021/22 which incorporates realistic and detailed savings plans and takes account of key budget and service risks
- ensure that it maintains an adequate level of reserves to mitigate the impact of budget risks, in particular one-off risks such as the Commonwealth Games and Equal Pay

Transparency and Governance

- ensure that its financial monitoring and budget reports are clear, transparent, and timely, particularly in relation to the use of reserves, whether in-year or at year-end
- report governance failures and emerging issues promptly and clearly to Members and local citizens

Subsidiary Bodies

- ensure that appropriate arrangements are implemented in relation to the Council's subsidiary bodies, including regular financial reporting and Council representation on subsidiary body boards, to ensure that emerging risks are monitored, reported and managed promptly

Place Directorate

- ensure that robust management and governance arrangements are put in place within the Place Directorate, particularly to ensure effective oversight of the waste service, to ensure that it delivers its financial and service objectives
4. This recommendation and the Council's formal response were considered at the Council meeting on 11th September 2018. A 12 month Action Plan was agreed and is being tracked by the Council's Audit Committee.
 5. We have now concluded that whilst good progress has been made in a number of areas in delivering against the recommendations, progress in relation to the refuse collection service, in particular, has been hampered by a new wave of industrial action. The Council, in addition, continues to face a number of very significant risks, which it is seeking to manage. Accordingly, we now consider it appropriate to make further statutory recommendations under 'the Act'. This is the third set of such recommendations that we have considered it appropriate to issue in just under two years.
 6. It is encouraging that the Council has made progress in the following areas:
 - Ofsted has, for the first time in recent history, recognised improvements in children's services. The service is still judged to require improvement, but this is an important and significant step forward.
 - the Council's Management Team (CMT) has been strengthened and refreshed, including, in the last year, a new Chief Executive, Chief Finance Officer and Assistant Chief Executive, all with considerable sector experience, which has increased capacity.
 - there is a new focus on delivering service improvements and robust financial management.
 - a new council plan and workforce strategy have been developed, reflecting the Council's priorities.
 - in-year financial reporting is more transparent, particularly concerning the use of reserves and the annual Financial Plan provides greater detail than previous plans.
 - the 2018/19 budget is on target to be delivered, with a smaller call on reserves than the budgeted £30m, with greater focus on budget management and financial accountability in Directorates.
 - CIPFA has been brought in as an improvement partner to help strengthen the finance function and move it towards a top quartile performing function.
 - governance has been strengthened in relation to the oversight of the Council's subsidiary bodies, which has involved Member training and a re-focus on the importance of the 'shareholder' function; and
 - there is to be a renewed focus on the customer and customer experience.
 7. This progress is not to be underestimated and represents a step forward by a new team of officers and members in a short period of time. We accept that it would be unrealistic to expect that a relatively new management team would be able to address, overnight, the deep-seated problems which have dogged the Council for over a decade. This will take time. The independent Improvement Panel's remit finishes in March 2019 and its concluding report will provide the Panel's own final assessment of progress made against the improvement challenge set by the Kerslake report.

8. Despite the progress made, however, our view, is that the Council faces some particular challenges which need to be tackled now. The way in which recent events in relation to the waste dispute is resolved will determine how much of a corner has been turned. Strong political leadership is required to implement the hard decisions required to deliver the transformational savings needed to protect financial resilience, and to mitigate the significant financial risks that the Council is facing.
9. Accordingly, we have made the following recommendations.

Recommendation made under paragraph 2 of Schedule 7 of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 ('the Act')

The Council is recommended to:

Governance and the Waste Service

- ensure that the terms of reference for the planned review of future options for the delivery of the refuse collection service, provide for the review to be carried out in a timely fashion, and include an examination of all options for delivering the refuse collection service going forward, in order that the service can demonstrate value for money in the delivery of its financial and service objectives; including, for instance:
 - looking to best practice models across the sector
 - examining different staffing and working arrangements
 - combining collection and disposal functions
 - other potential options, such as outsourcing
- build industrial relations capability within the Council to ensure that it is able to maintain consistent and effective relations with its trade union partners.
- commission a review of the new working practices in place within the refuse service to ensure that they are embedded and monitored robustly to minimise the potential for further Equal Pay claims

Finance

- continue to reduce the likelihood of the non-delivery of savings plans for 2019/20 and beyond through the delivery of clear plans and robust programme management arrangements
- broaden transformational work across the Council's financial plan for 2019/20 to 2022/23, to help deliver savings at scale to address the impact of the combined savings and budget pressure risks
- keep under close review the potential impact of one-off budget risks, such as the Commonwealth Games, Equal Pay and Amey, by:
 - continuing to strengthen its level of reserves; and
 - completing the development of contingency plans to minimise the effects of these risks should they crystallise.

Governance and the Waste Service

10. The Kerslake Report of December 2014, concluded that:

‘For a number of years and successive administrations, the council’s members and senior officers have not gripped some very significant issues, such as children’s services, waste management and equal pay. Instead there have been a series of short term fixes and annual salami slicing of services which have kicked the can down the road [...] this is no longer sustainable.’

11. The report argued that successive administrations had swept deep-rooted problems ‘under the carpet’. It went on to argue that the most important thing that the Council needed to do to improve was to change its corporate culture. Some four years on, of the significant issues referenced by Kerslake, children’s services show signs of improvement, but waste management and equal pay remain significant challenges. It is therefore legitimate to question the extent to which corporate governance has improved in the last four years.

12. While corporate management capability and capacity has strengthened, the Council has, at times, continued to exhibit the same short-termism, and tendency to avoid managing deep-rooted problems, that Kerslake identified as being the biggest block to progress four years ago. Nowhere is this better illustrated than the Council’s approach to waste services. We were critical of the Council’s failure to manage its waste services effectively in July 2018 and issued the following statutory recommendation to address its shortcomings in this respect:

‘[the Council should] ensure that robust management and governance arrangements are put in place within the Place Directorate, particularly to ensure effective oversight of the waste service, to ensure that it delivers its financial and service objectives.’

13. Our 2017/18 Annual Audit letter noted that the events leading to the original waste strike being suspended on 16 August 2017, then re-instated on 1 September 2017 when 106 workers were handed their redundancy notices:

‘did not serve to enhance confidence in the Council’s systems of governance [...] Members will recall that a key strand of the Kerslake report related to the need to re-set member-officer relations. It is of concern that initial improvements in this area may not have been sustained.’

14. The original waste strike and the failure to introduce revised working arrangements until September 2018 (which have still not been formally signed off by the unions) have given rise to significant budget pressures in both 2017/18 and 2018/19. The total additional cost of the original waste strike was of the order of £6.6m.

15. Subsequently, the Council commissioned external solicitors to review the actions of the former Leader and Cabinet in relation to the conduct of the original waste dispute over the summer/autumn of 2017. The report, which the Council published in the public domain in December 2018, concluded that the former Leader had acted unlawfully in seeking to overturn a decision made by Cabinet on 27 June 2017 regarding the re-organisation of the waste service.

16. The report states that the Leader had purported to make an agreement with Unite at ACAS to reverse the Cabinet's decision to delete 113 grade 3 posts. It goes on to say that he subsequently sought to ratify his decision via an informal Cabinet meeting on 18 August 2017. The report concludes, however, that the informal Cabinet was not a formal decision-making body and therefore had no powers to ratify the Leader's decision. The report argues that the Council should have proceeded to implement the decisions made in the 27 June report or have made a decision at a formally instituted Cabinet to modify its original decision, which would then have been lawful.
17. The report's conclusions are stark and echo many of the findings of the original Kerslake Report in relation to the Council's systems of governance. In this respect, the report notes:

'At the heart of this matter lies an ongoing failure to accept the norms of decision-making. This is the DNA that is the day to day governance of a council and its heart and at the material time, namely in 2017 was missing/distorted at BCC [...] The Cabinet did not operate effectively during this time. It was dysfunctional not a cabinet [...] collectively they were not an effective team. They were also played off against each other by the Leader. Meetings when they did happen were ineffective. When presented with the ACAS meeting and outcome, Cabinet members did not challenge the Leader collectively over his actions and did not stop Cllr Clancy as might be expected. At least one said that they did not do so because they did not want to lose their job as a cabinet member [...] The senior officer management team (CLT) was dysfunctional during this time.'
18. It is a picture that Kerslake would have recognised.
19. Following the original waste dispute, the former Leader resigned and a new Leader was installed in the autumn of 2017. The action was suspended on 20 September 2017 when Unite the union ('Unite') won an injunction blocking the proposed redundancies. The Court ordered the re-instatement of the dismissed workers but also the immediate implementation of the proposed revised working arrangements, incorporating in particular, a move to five day working. Whilst the dismissed workers were reinstated in different roles in January 2018, the revised working arrangements were not introduced until September 2018 and have still not been formally signed off by the unions.
20. Subsequently Unite commenced industrial action on 14 December 2018, by announcing that members would work to rule. Unite had learned that the Council had made payments totaling £68,645 to GMB members in the waste service in May 2018 on the grounds that the Council had failed to consult GMB over proposals to dismiss waste service employees as redundant, contrary to s.188 of The Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992. According to the Cabinet report of 15 January 2019, the exclusion of GMB had been at the insistence of Unite, which Unite denies. The Council has subsequently conceded that Unite was correct in this assertion. The payments to GMB members were made under delegated arrangements and were accordingly not set out in a report to Cabinet.

21. Unite argued that there was no breach of s.188, alleged blacklisting and trade union discrimination, and demanded that its members receive similar payments to those made to GMB members. The total cost of this claim was of the order of £1.7m, as payments would also have to be made to Unison waste service members. Certain Unite members have also brought ET proceedings against the Council, alleging that the payments to GMB have been to the detriment of Unite members, on a variety of grounds. ET proceedings were timetabled for February 2020. On 11 January 2019 Unite informed the Council of its intention to begin continuous industrial action, based around working to rule, commencing 25 January 2019. The industrial action had the potential to run for some time and was causing considerable disruption to services, with additional costs running at up to £0.35m per week to bring in external contractors to remedy incomplete work.
22. In response, a public and a private report were presented to Cabinet on 15 January 2019, setting out the Council's proposed plans to deal with the industrial action. The public report stated that 'the Council does not in any way agree with Unite's position', and that it had little merit, in the Council's view. It set out four options to address the industrial dispute:
- do nothing;
 - make the payments to Unite members
 - seek binding arbitration; and
 - obtain a Court order (or 'injunction') to prevent the industrial action continuing on the grounds that it was unlawful.
23. The first two options were not recommended in the report. In particular, the second option of making payments to Unite members, was not supported, principally because, as the report states, there was 'no legitimate reason' to make payments to these workers, indeed, 'to make equivalent payments to them could be ultra vires.' The report also stated that making such payments could also represent a 'contagion' risk as other groups of Council staff might also, in future, resist any initiatives to reconfigure services to reduce costs in a similar way. The public paper states that the Council's options to respond to Unite 'are set out in this report and also the Private Report.'
24. Following the Cabinet meeting it was announced in the press and local media that the Council was to adopt a twin-track approach by pursuing arbitration, with the agreement of both parties, and by seeking a Court order to prevent the industrial action. The Council was concerned that, given a Court hearing date of February 2020 for the ET proceedings, significant additional costs might accrue, assuming that industrial action continued. The Cabinet member for Clean Streets, Waste and Recycling, however, promptly resigned as he was opposed to the proposed injunction. Unite then issued proceedings to obtain an injunction, later to be joined by Unison. Unite also announced a new programme of industrial action.
25. While the Council's legal advisers had advised that the industrial action was unlawful, the Council took subsequent legal advice which argued that it would be lawful for the Council to make payments to Union members, if they were made, pursuant to settling litigation, rather than being made in recognition of the validity of Unite's claim. Our own legal opinion broadly reflected the Council's legal advice. Negotiations on a 'without prejudice' basis were then conducted with the Unions with a view to agreeing suitable payments to end the dispute. These were not successful.

26. A suite of options was then included in a report for Cabinet to consider on 12 February 2019 to resolve the dispute, which broadly reflected the options provided within the Cabinet report of 15 January 2019. The report included no officer recommendation. On the day of the Cabinet meeting, however, a late hybrid option was included in the report, option 5, which was to seek a negotiated settlement through ACAS. This involved making the offer of payments to Unite and Unison members to end the dispute. It also stipulated, however, that, should the offer not be accepted by close of play on February 12, the Council would move to injunct the unions. Discussions subsequently broke down and the Council accordingly put in place its plans to take legal action by way of injunction. This was a difficult decision for the administration to take.
27. On 28 February 2019, the case was heard and the Council was not successful in its application for an injunction preventing the current industrial action of Unite and Unison from continuing. In summary, the Court held that s.222 (1) (b) TULRCA required the Court to look at a union's reasons for undertaking industrial action. What mattered, the Court held, was the belief of the union. He concluded in this instance that the unions believed that industrial action was to seek parity payments for their members. The Council decided against appealing the Court judgment.
28. Subsequently, following discussions at ACAS, the Council and Unite agreed, on a without prejudice basis, a draft Heads of Terms which was approved by Cabinet on 15 March 2019. These proposals are intended to settle all litigation and all industrial disputes including ceasing all current industrial action. The public Cabinet report states that the Council will pay to Unison and Unite members, in summary, £3,000 to all valid individual claimants, and an additional payment of £500 to all individuals who were members of each union as set out in the Heads of Terms agreed by cabinet on 15th March 2019. The amounts are likely to be net of any applicable tax or national insurance. The gross amount payable to a standard rate taxpayer if tax and NI were payable, would be £5,754 to each individual. This will cost £1.864m in total. The proposed settlement needs now to be formally signed off by all parties.
29. Whilst a potential end to the industrial dispute, is a welcome outcome, it comes at a cost:
- the failure to consult with GMB in 2017 over the changes to working arrangements led the Council to make payments to GMB of £68,645, of itself a relatively modest sum. However, this was to have far-reaching and 'unintended consequences', in the Council's own words, resulting in the industrial action taken by Unite and Unison, disruption to services, and additional costs amounting to £6m to hire agency staff and other costs and to settle the dispute.
 - in addition, the Council will also have to pay £1.864m to bring to an end the dispute to Unite and Unison members.
30. A positive outcome, is that the draft Heads of Terms provide for an independent review of future options for the waste service to be carried out. The terms of reference for the review will be set by the Council on 26th March 2019. A Joint Services Improvement Board will be established and will be consulted upon in relation to the terms of reference. The Board will be chaired by a Cabinet Member and the membership will include all joint trade unions GMB, Unison and Unite.

31. This is, an important moment for Council and its politicians, in particular, to demonstrate, that they can act in a decisive manner to tackle a long-standing issue. The way in which the review is managed will impact on the Council's ability to contain the 'contagion' risk referred to in the Cabinet report of 15 January 2019. The Council has a challenging industrial relations history as the ongoing strike action involving the enablement service, which commenced in 2017, demonstrates.
32. The Council now has a chance to improve its relations with trade union partners by building industrial relations capability and also to look at options to ensure that the waste service delivers value for money for local citizens. In this respect, it is important that the independent review, agreed as part of the Terms of Settlement, should include all options for delivering the service going forward, so that any decision is informed by a comprehensive analysis of the choices available to the Council.
33. Assuming that the present dispute is resolved satisfactorily, it will still remain the case that the service is not as efficient as it could be. For instance, few councils that we are aware of, employ a waste reduction collection officer on each refuse freighter. Refuse collection also has a history of service disruption which does not represent a good stewardship of public funds.
34. In addition, looking back over the history of the waste dispute, the Council's unwillingness over a long period to tackle working practices within the waste refuse service has also cost it dearly. In particular, over the last decade, many of the Council's Equal Pay claims have resulted from comparisons between male refuse workers and female workers deemed to be in comparable posts who were paid significantly less. The Council has received claims under the Equal Pay Act 1970 and recognised total Equal Pay (EP) liabilities totalling £1.2bn, which relate to working practices and changes to terms and conditions which have been in place for more than a decade. This has involved successive political administrations. Funding the payment of these claims has proved a significant ongoing drain on the Council's finances.
35. The Council has put in place revised working arrangements in the waste service, and monitoring arrangements, to ensure that they minimise the potential for further Equal Pay claims. The Council also agreed a Mitigation Strategy on 24 August 2018 to include review of working practices Council-wide, to ensure compliance with equal pay requirements. It would seem sensible to gain further assurance around the robustness of these arrangements, as they pertain to waste services, by commissioning a review to ensure that they are embedded and are being monitored robustly.

36. For these reasons we make the following recommendations:

The Council is recommended to:

- **ensure that the terms of reference for the planned review of future options for the delivery of the refuse collection service, provide for the review to be carried out in a timely fashion, and include an examination of all options for delivering the refuse collection service going forward, in order that the service can demonstrate value for money in the delivery of its financial and service objectives; including, for instance:**
 - **looking to best practice models across the sector**
 - **examining different staffing and working arrangements**
 - **combining collection and disposal functions**
 - **other potential options, such as outsourcing**
- **build industrial relations capability within the Council to ensure that it is able to maintain consistent and effective relations with its trade union partners**
- **commission a review of the new working practices in place within the refuse service to ensure that they are embedded and monitored robustly to minimise the potential for further Equal Pay claims**

Finance

Savings Plan delivery

37. The Council has not delivered all of its planned savings in recent years. In 2017/18, the Council reported a net overspend of £4.9m after use of £63.1m of reserves (£42.2m of which were planned) plus £11.7m to fund pension guarantees. The Council applied £116.8m of reserves in 2016/17 and 2017/18 to deliver a cumulative deficit of £35m. We noted in our Audit Findings report for 2017/18:

‘If the Council had not applied any reserves over the last two years, it would have had to deliver £150m more in cumulative savings to achieve balance. It has effectively been running an annual deficit of £75m.’

38. The Council has, however, made progress in the last 12 months. The Council’s financial plan provides for £52.9m of savings in the current year, 2018/19, after applying £30.5m of reserves. In this respect, the month 9 budget report is forecasting a £2m overspend, which is a stronger position than at the same stage this time last year, when the Council reported a £4.5m overspend after the utilisation of £75m of reserves. It is also expected that not all of the £30.5m will need to be utilised to support the budget. Under delivery of savings in 2018/19 is likely to amount to £9.7m (18% of planned savings) which is a better position than in previous years. In 2017/18 under delivery of savings amounted to £22.6m (32% of planned savings) and £55.8m (63% of planned savings) in 2016/17. Bearing down on non-delivery of planned savings will continue to be a very important area of focus for the Council.

39. 2019/20 and beyond, however, continues to look extremely challenging. The Council is seeking to strengthen its monitoring processes and embed accountability for delivery of savings more strongly within Directorates. The Council needs to deliver £86m in savings by 2022/23. To put this into context, this is equivalent to around 8% of its current controllable budget (that is, excluding non-controllable costs such as delegated expenditure to schools). £36m of savings needs to be delivered in the next financial year, 2019/20, but £18m in savings, are still being consulted on. Savings to be consulted on in the following three years amount to £73m.
40. The Financial Plan for 2019/20 to 2020/23 includes mostly medium-scale savings plans but includes few 'transformational' savings plans. The Council argues that it has learnt lessons from the non-delivery of large savings plans in the past and that it will now only include transformational plans in its Financial Plan that are properly worked up. This is a sensible approach, but the absence of transformational plans within the current Financial Plan, will become more important in later years as it may become more difficult to achieve significant savings through less ambitious schemes. There are a number of one-off budget risks, (referred to later) which if they crystallised, might require an increase in the amount of savings to be delivered. Equally the Council needs budget headroom programme to meet any other changes in business assumptions in the overall medium term financial plan.
41. In this respect, there is an opportunity to broaden existing transformational work across the Council's financial plan for 2019/20 to 2020/23 to help deliver additional savings at scale to address the impact of the combined savings and budget risk pressures. The current financial plan includes a savings plan to reduce the costs of social care high-cost provision by £6.25m in 2019/20, but this plan remains an exception.
42. There is also an opportunity to learn from past experience. Some large projects have delivered more substantial savings, others have not. For instance, the 2017+ Financial Plan provided for an ambitious plan to radically reorganise the Early Years Service. This was one of the largest of the Council's transformational plans. The initiative was intended to deliver £10m in savings. A recent Internal Audit Report of January 2019 explained that a key element of the reorganisation plans involved the TUPE transfer of 140 Council staff to four partner organisations. However, due to late concerns expressed in relation to collective bargaining rights, staff have been, instead, seconded and not TUPE'd to the partner organisations. As a result, according to the Internal Audit report, the £10m predicted savings from the initiative will 'almost certainly not be achieved.' The delay in starting the contract has cost £4.7m according to the report.
43. It is right to exclude any project from the Financial Plan which is not sufficiently well-developed. The example of the Early Years Service project, however, should not deter the Council from continuing to develop similarly ambitious projects. The experience of that project, and, indeed the waste services dispute, suggest that cost reduction schemes involving significant service re-configuration, may require more effective engagement with staff and unions at the outset, and better joint understanding of the objectives of the change plans by Members and officers. The approach that the Council intends to take review the future operation of the waste service, reflects this approach, and if well-managed, could provide a model for other service reviews.

Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP)

44. The Council is seeking to develop a more robust MTFP which is less dependent on the use of reserves to support budget delivery. Whilst the original 2018/19 plan, as noted, was reliant on £30.5m of reserves, the Council argues that this was a recognition that it needs time and capacity to transform its services. The Council is seeking to strengthen financial resilience by setting a maximum council tax increase of 4.99% for 2019/20.
45. The MTFP is central to delivering financial balance over the medium term. It reflects current assumptions about future service and financial pressures and likely fee, government grant and other income trends. Developing more transformational savings plans may be one way in which the Council can build in headroom to accommodate financial pressures arising from increases in service demand, legislative requirements and, in particular the large one-off risks, such as The Commonwealth Games and Equal Pay, which are only two of the potential financial pinch-points referred to in the next section.

Adequacy of Reserves

46. The Draft Financial Plan 2019-2023 notes that the Council will hold £152.8m in general reserves and £121m in earmarked reserves at the end of 2019/20. A Policy Contingency of £42.2m is also available 'to protect against unplanned expenditure.' The earmarked reserves are planned for specific uses and are therefore not available to support the general budget. Therefore, in reality, the Council has effectively £195m to support the budget and to meet contingencies.
47. The Council has recognised that it cannot continue to use reserves to support the revenue position, as it has done up to 2018-19. It also plans to make a net contribution to reserves of £17m in 2019/20. The Council's new reserves policy makes it clear that general reserves should not be used to mitigate the requirement to make ongoing savings. The 2019-20 budget, however, relies upon the use of £5.9m in general reserves to support the budget, and £21.1m (net) of earmarked and other reserves will also be applied elsewhere, for instance, to pump-prime savings schemes.
48. While the Council's reserves, earmarked and un-earmarked, are substantial, they should be viewed in the context of the unique financial risks that the Council faces, which are more considerable than those faced by most other local authorities. These remain significant; key risks have emerged as follows:
- **Equal Pay:** remains a significant financial risk, although it is difficult to quantify the extent of the risk as there are inherent uncertainties surrounding the potential volume, timing and chances of success of any future claims. The incidence of claims has reduced in recent years and the Council has been negotiating an agreement with the main unions which will mitigate risk.
 - **Commonwealth Games:** at December 2017, the Council had committed to providing £184.7m for the project, £145.1m in capital funding and £39.6m to meet revenue expenditure. These are considerable commitments. The Council will also incur additional costs during the Games and the project assumes partnership funding of £75m of which £30m still needs to be agreed by partners. The Council has budgeted for the expected cost of the games and, in addition has provided a £4.7m provision in 2018/19 to further mitigate timing risk. Pressure must be maintained to ensure that the overall budget is not exceeded, either through construction projects not coming in on budget, or through escalation of costs elsewhere. Accordingly, there remains a risk that the Council might have to meet further liabilities if costs are not well controlled.

- **Amey Contract:** this contract was one of the first Highways PFI contracts and commenced in 2010. It is a £2.7bn project over 25 years, involving a £328m refurbishment of the highway infrastructure. Following a series of legal challenges, the Court of Appeal determined that Amey's interpretation of the contract from 2014 had the effect of reducing its workload. The Court ruled that this interpretation was incorrect. Subsequently Amey and the Council have been in dispute regarding amounts due to the Council, following the Court ruling, and the Council has, in turn, withheld contractual payments from Amey. Negotiations are ongoing to resolve the dispute but there remains a risk that Amey could exit the contract which could result in financial liabilities accruing to the Council. In particular, the Council remains highly dependent on Government-funded PFI credits which contribute £50m towards the annual £80m unitary charge for the highways services provided. If the PFI arrangement could not be continued, the Council would face a very significant financial liability.
- **Paradise Circus:** is a Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) programme started in 2014, carried out under the auspices of the City Enterprise Zone (EZ). It will develop office space, hotel and car-parking around Paradise Circus, a City Centre site under three anticipated phases. Phase 1 has overspent by £29.1m (from £37.68m to £66.79m) and Phase 2 costs are anticipated to increase by £21.43m (from £28m to £49.45m) yielding a total cost overrun of £50.53m. The Council's own arrangement for oversight of the project, as problems emerged, were inadequate. The project finances have now been restructured and remains fully funded through Business Rate growth via the EZ programme within the GBSLEP. The restructured deal provides additional benefits and risk mitigations to the Council and strong management is needed between BCC, GBSLEP and the PCLP to ensure that no further overspends occur on the remainder of the project. The Council is the Accountable Body.
- **Acivico:** is a Council wholly-owned company which has been poorly managed in recent years. The Council funded the write-off of a £10m deficit in 2017-18. The Council has put in place a refreshed management team during 2018-19 and involved a turnaround team to help the company attain greater financial stability. The Council will then make a decision as to the company's longer-term future. Early signs are that progress is being made and the Council's financial exposure is now better understood and more actively managed. It remains, however, a financial risk for the Council, albeit not on the scale of the risks outlined above.

49. There are other potential financial risks which are signposted in the Council's Draft Financial Plan 2019-2023, including the potential need to increase employer pension contributions, as well as additional service cost pressures, particularly in relation to social care service. The Council is prudent in recognising and articulating these risks.

50. However, the Council in our view faces a unique level of one-off risks. In addition, any failure to deliver on planned savings over the next three years, could also lead to a depletion of reserves. Having regard to these risks, we make the following recommendation:

The Council is recommended to:

Finance

- **continue to reduce the likelihood of the non-delivery of savings plans for 2019/20 and beyond through the delivery of clear plans and robust programme management arrangements**
- **broaden transformational work across the Council's financial plan for 2019/20 to 2022/23, to help deliver savings at scale to address the impact of the combined savings and budget pressure risks**
- **keep under close review the potential impact of one-off budget risks, such as the Commonwealth Games, Equal Pay and Amey, by:**
 - **continuing to strengthen its level of reserves; and**
 - **completing the development of contingency plans to minimise the effects of these risks should they crystallise.**

What does the Council need to do next?

51. Section 24 of The Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (Schedule 7), requires the Council to:

- consider our recommendations at a meeting held within one month of the recommendations being sent to the Council; and
- at that meeting the Council must decide:
 - (a) whether the recommendations are to be accepted, and
 - (b) what, if any, action to take in response to the recommendations.

52. Following the meeting the Council needs to notify us, as the Council's auditors, of its decisions and publish a notice containing a summary of its decisions which has been approved by us.

