
| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------|------------------------|
| Report To: | Policy & Resources Committee | Date: | 11 August 2015 |
| Report By: | Chief Financial Officer | Report No: | FIN/53/15/MT/AP |
| Contact Officer: | Matt Thomson | Contact No: | 712256 |
| Subject: | 2014/15 Capital Programme Performance | | |

1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise Committee of the performance in respect of the delivery of 2014/15 Capital Programme.

2.0 SUMMARY

- 2.1 Capital slippage has been an issue which has arisen over a number of years within the Council. This issue, however, is not confined to Inverclyde Council and the Accounts Commission Annual Overview Report and surveys carried out by Directors of Finance would indicate that many Councils continue to experience difficulties in this area.
- 2.2 Robust action was taken in 2011/12 led by the Corporate Director Environment, Regeneration & Resources to significantly improve matters and a major improvement was achieved in 2012/13. However, in 2013/14 slippage increased and actions were identified in August 2014 to address this. While there has been improvement in terms of identifying slippage earlier in the year slippage and accelerating projects, 2014/15 outturned at 15.3%. As can be seen from Appendix 1 this is well under the average of the last 6 years.
- 2.3 Appendix 2 provides a summary of the main areas of slippage with reasons for the slippage provided by Lead Officers. This Appendix has been reviewed by the Asset Management CIG. As has previously been the case, it is clear that slippage is not attributable to either a single project or a single reason. It should be noted however that 7.3% of the slippage related to either delays due to policy decisions or to project cost reductions. Further projects were advanced where possible resulting in net slippage, excluding policy decisions and cost reductions, of 8.1%.
- 2.4 Areas for improvement previously proposed by the Corporate Management Team centre around earlier identification of slippage and greater support and challenge during the consultation on Capital Reports to Committee. These actions have had a positive impact and the full benefit will be expected in 2015/16.
- 2.5 Audit Scotland recently met with Senior Officers of the Council as part of a national follow up report on managing major capital projects. Discussions were positive and the national report will be issued early in 2016.

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Committee note the 2014/15 Capital Out-turn Position.
- 3.2 It is recommended that the Committee note the impact of the previously agreed actions and that the full year impact will occur in 2015/16.

Alan Puckrin
Chief Financial Officer

4.0 BACKGROUND

- 4.1 The issue of Capital Slippage has been one which has been regularly identified and reported on by the Council's External Auditors for many years. This situation is not unique to Inverclyde Council and is regularly reported in the Accounts Commission Annual Overview Report plus the results of surveys carried out by Directors of Finance.
- 4.2 The Corporate Director Environment, Regeneration & Resources undertook action as part of the budget setting process in 2012 to significantly reduce slippage and this was highly successful in 2012/13 when slippage reduced to less than 10%. However, in 2013/14 slippage increased and actions were identified in August 2014 to address this.

5.0 2014/15 CAPITAL DELIVERY PERFORMANCE

- 5.1 Subject to the audit of the Final Accounts, the Capital Slippage for 2014/15 has increased from 14.5% in 2013/14 to 15.3% in 2014/15. Whilst this is an increase in slippage from 2013/14 Committee is asked to note from Appendix 1 that the overall slippage level of 15.3% is well under the average of the last 6 years, actions agreed in August 2014 had a positive benefit as outlined below.
- 5.2 Appendix 2 provides an analysis approved by the Asset Management CIG of the main areas of slippage. This analysis contains a commentary by the Lead Officer and a categorisation of the type of slippage. This latter issue is not an exact science, but does give an indication of what the main reason for the slippage.
- 5.3 It can be seen that there is no single reason or single project which caused the increase in slippage in 2014/15. It should be noted though that 7.3 % of this relates either to delays due to Policy decisions (4.2%) mainly in relation to the budget savings exercise or to project cost reductions (3.1%). Excluding these items and after taking into account that projects were advanced to replace slipped projects this resulted in net slippage of 8.1%. There were a relatively small number of major projects which contributed to the majority of the slippage.
- 5.4 Committee agreed improvements to address slippage levels in August 2014, these improvements were as follows:
 - a) Early notification of slippage – the main area of concern regarding the 2013/14 slippage was the late notification reporting of slippage to Committee. The CMT agreed that Corporate Directors needed to robustly review the phasings with relevant Officers before signing off Committee Capital reports. It can be seen from Appendix 3 that the majority of Capital slippage was reported to Committee in the September Committee cycle with a small increase in the November Committee cycle, the remainder of the slippage was then reported in March. It can be seen that this was a major improvement from 2013/14. The action taken to identify slippage early can be seen to be effective in that Officers were able to accelerate projects to mitigate further slippage.
 - b) Performance Targets - the Chief Executive set an upper limit of 10% slippage for each Corporate Director for 2014/15 as part of the Performance Appraisal process and performance against this was closely monitored. The clear expectation was that actual slippage would be under 10%. Appendix 2a summarises slippage by Committee and by Directorate, from this it can be seen that the Directorate performance was as follows:

Corporate Director, Environment, Regeneration & Resources – overall slippage 17.8% however of this 11.3% was due to Policy decisions or project cost reductions, excluding these slippage was 6.5%.

Corporate Director, Education, Communities & Organisational Development – overall slippage of 12.1% of which 0.5% was due to Policy decisions or project cost reductions, excluding these slippage was 11.6%. It should be noted however that the majority of this (10.3%) was due to slippage on the Inverkip Community Facility which has experienced slippage due to specific, significant issues.

Corporate Director, Health & Social Care – overall projects amounting to 41% were advanced, it should be recognised however that this is high in percentage terms due to the small budget in this Directorate, the actual value advanced was £80,000.

- c) Identify possible acceleration – allied to the early identification of slippage is the potential to identify alternative projects which could be accelerated. Roads investment in particular lends itself to this approach where projects can be developed and delivered in a far shorter timescale than many other capital projects. During 2014/15 a total of £3.2m (10.6%) was advanced to mitigate slippage. Officers have already identified projects for advancement in 2015/16 and this will be reported as part of the routine Capital monitoring reports during the year.
- d) Anticipate delays due to external factors – the increasing number of projects requiring working with other Partners, the Third Sector or the Community was identified as an issue, often linked to the potential to apply for external funding which will lead to delays, some of which can be substantial. It was recognised that a more realistic view of the timescales for the delivery of projects should be taken at the time of agreeing phasing as aspects of the project will be outwith the Council's direct control. At the time of this recommendation 2014/15 budget levels had already been set and therefore no such action could be taken to influence 2014/15 slippage levels, 7.8% of slippage in 2014/15 was in this area. This has been taken into consideration when agreeing the 2015/16 budget and should be applied in future years also, it is expected that slippage should reduce as a result.

5.5 The Asset Management CIG continues to meet bi monthly to review delivery performance and receives detailed RAG reports. This assists in identifying areas to focus upon and ensures a corporate response to addressing potential delays.

5.6 Audit Scotland recently met with Senior Officers of the Council as part of a national follow up report on managing major capital projects. Discussions were positive and the national report will be issued early in 2016.

6.0 IMPLICATIONS

Finance

6.1 Whilst there are no direct financial implications which can be quantified arising from general slippage, there can be an opportunity cost to the Council from the late delivery of projects.

Financial Implications:

One off Costs

| Cost Centre | Budget Heading | Budget Years | Proposed Spend this Report £000 | Virement From | Other Comments |
|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| N/A | | | | | |

Annually Recurring Costs/ (Savings)

| Cost Centre | Budget Heading | With Effect from | Annual Net Impact £000 | Virement From (If Applicable) | Other Comments |
|-------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| N/A | | | | | |

Legal

6.2 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Human Resources

6.3 The Corporate Director, Environment Regeneration & Resources and his Heads of Service regularly review resourcing levels to ensure sufficient resources are in place to deliver the capital programme supported by the use of framework agreements where appropriate to access resources timeously.

Equalities

6.4 There are no direct equalities implications arising from this report.

Repopulation

6.5 Delivery of projects on time and within budget helps increase public confidence in the Council, will improve the perception of Inverclyde and as such reducing Capital Slippage and improving delivery performance will make the area more attractive to residents and potential incomers.

7.0 CONSULTATIONS

7.1 This report has been produced in consultation with the Corporate Management Team.

8.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

8.1 None.

Annual Slippage Summary

Appendix 1

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Budget</u> <u>£000's</u> | <u>Slippage</u> <u>£000's</u> | <u>%age</u> |
|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 2009/10 | 24,878 | 9,342 | 37.6% |
| 2010/11 | 33,626 | 14,633 | 43.5% |
| 2011/12 | 45,730 | 14,130 | 30.9% |
| 2012/13 | 54,302 | 5,072 | 9.3% |
| 2013/14 | 38,975 | 5,632 | 14.5% |
| 2014/15 | 29,722 | 4,556 | 15.3% |
| 6 year average | 37,872 | 8,894 | 23.5% |

Summary of Reported Slippage by Category

Appendix 2a

| Committee | Policy Decision | | Project Cost Reduced | | Internal Slippage | | Delay involving 3rd Party | | Minor Slippage | | Accelerated Projects | | Total | |
|---|-----------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| | £000 | %age | £000 | %age | £000 | %age | £000 | %age | £000 | %age | £000 | %age | £000 | %age |
| Policy & Resources | - | 0.0% | (95) | (12.0)% | - | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | (80) | (10.1)% | 159 | 20.2% | (16) | (2.0)% |
| Environment, Regeneration & Resources | (1,257) | (7.0)% | (753) | (4.2)% | (1,324) | (7.4)% | (637) | (3.6)% | (235) | (1.3)% | 895 | 5.0% | (3,311) | (18.5)% |
| Education & Lifelong Learning | - | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | (326) | (9.3)% | (1,484) | (42.6)% | - | 0.0% | 96 | 2.8% | (1,714) | (49.2)% |
| School Estate | - | 0.0% | (59) | (0.8)% | (1,217) | (16.6)% | (181) | (2.5)% | (36) | (0.5)% | 1,898 | 25.8% | 405 | 5.5% |
| Health & Social Care | - | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | (34) | (17.4)% | 114 | 58.5% | 80 | 41.0% |
| Total | (1,257) | (4.2)% | (907) | (3.1)% | (2,867) | (9.6)% | (2,302) | (7.7)% | (385) | (1.3)% | 3,162 | 10.6% | (4,556) | (15.3)% |
| Directorate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environment, Regeneration & Resources | (1,257) | (6.7)% | (848) | (4.5)% | (1,324) | (7.1)% | (637) | (3.4)% | (315) | (1.7)% | 1,054 | 5.6% | (3,327) | (17.8)% |
| Education, Communities & Organisational Development | - | 0.0% | (59) | (0.5)% | (1,543) | (14.2)% | (1,665) | (15.4)% | (36) | (0.3)% | 1,994 | 18.4% | (1,309) | (12.1)% |
| Health & Social Care | - | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | (34) | (17.4)% | 114 | 58.5% | 80 | 41.0% |
| Total | (1,257) | (4.2)% | (907) | (3.1)% | (2,867) | (9.6)% | (2,302) | (7.7)% | (385) | (1.3)% | 3,162 | 10.6% | (4,556) | (15.3)% |

| | Approved Budget 2014/15 £000's | Draft 2014/15 Final Outturn £000's | Slippage from Approved Budget £000's | Slippage from Approved Budget %age | 1 Policy Decision £000's | 2 Project Cost Reduced £000's | 3 Internal Slippage £000's | 4 Delay involving 3rd Party £000's | 5 Minor Slippage £000's | 6 Accelerated Projects | Comments |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Policy & Resources | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 565 | 470 | (95) | (16.81)% | | (95) | | | | | The original estimate is based on indicative figures. The actual spend varies with annual price changes as well as differences highlighted in site audits. ICT were also able to access a Microsoft funded Technology Access Programme to achieve significant discounts in PCs and Laptops for schools. |
| Rolling Replacement of PC's | | | | | | | | | | 79 | |
| Server & Switch Replacement Programme | 3 | 82 | 79 | 2,633.33% | | | | | | 80 | |
| Modernisation Fund | 23 | 103 | 80 | 347.83% | | | | | | | |
| Various Projects | 198 | 118 | (80) | (40.40)% | | | | | (80) | | Various projects came in under budget, although areas such as Interactive Whiteboard refresh and Switch upgrades did take place. Vendor delays resulted in key milestone payments being deferred. |
| TOTAL Policy & Resources | 789 | 773 | (16) | (2.03)% | 0 | (95) | 0 | 0 | (80) | 159 | |
| Environment & Regeneration | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Services - Roads | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Measures | 124 | 71 | (53) | (42.74)% | | (53) | | | | | Lower than anticipated tender prices received |
| Parking Strategy | 206 | 97 | (109) | (52.91)% | | | | (109) | | | Car park purchase negotiations ongoing |
| SPT | 207 | 128 | (79) | (38.16)% | | | | (79) | | | One project abandoned because land owner untraceable |
| Flooding Strategy - Greenock Central | 423 | 336 | (87) | (20.57)% | | (87) | | | | | Lower than anticipated tender prices received |
| Langhouse Road Development | 0 | 77 | 77 | #DIV/0! | | | | | | 77 | |
| Various Projects | 253 | 180 | (73) | (28.85)% | | | | | (73) | | |
| Roads Asset Management Plan | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Carriageways | 3,323 | 3,755 | 432 | 13.00% | | | | | | 432 | |
| Footways | 350 | 295 | (55) | (15.71)% | | (55) | | | | | Schemes brought forward from 15/16 but some schemes came in under estimated cost. |
| Structures | 697 | 515 | (182) | (26.11)% | | | | (182) | | | SEPA instructed delays due to environmental concerns |
| Lighting | 557 | 266 | (291) | (52.24)% | | | (291) | | | | Lantern & lantern/column replacement schemes slipped due to column survey & business case development during 14/15 |
| Staff Costs | 480 | 326 | (154) | (32.08)% | | | (154) | | | | Resignation of temporary staff & difficulties in recruitment |
| Environmental Services | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fox Street - Play Area | 90 | 10 | (80) | (88.89)% | | | (80) | | | | Consultant slow in delivery of production information. |
| Skatepark - Play Area | 165 | 58 | (107) | (64.85)% | | | (107) | | | | Project was late starting on site. Complicated due to single tender return and design and build nature of works. Delay in final delivery due to inclement weather and specialised nature of concrete. |
| Coronation Park Port Glasgow - Seawall Repairs | 190 | 65 | (125) | (65.79)% | | | (125) | | | | Project was on site over the winter period and heavily reliant on weather and tidal conditions. |
| Coronation Park Port Glasgow - To be identified | 60 | 0 | (60) | (100.00)% | (60) | | | | | | Policy decision to delay spend pending further report. |
| Various Projects | 2,032 | 1,946 | (86) | (4.23)% | | | | | (86) | | |
| Regeneration and Planning | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gourock Pier & Railhead Development Area | 1,378 | 1,481 | 103 | 7.47% | | | | | | 103 | |
| Broomhill Regeneration | 145 | 0 | (145) | (100.00)% | | | (145) | | | | Managed by RI however don't think we can class as 3rd party. |
| Port Glasgow Town Centre Regeneration | 106 | 14 | (92) | (86.79)% | | | (92) | | | | Managed by RI however don't think we can class as 3rd party. |
| SV Comet | 141 | 0 | (141) | (100.00)% | (141) | | | | | | Scope of project revised, costs reduced. |
| Rankin Park Grass Pitch and Pavilion | 243 | 116 | (127) | (52.26)% | | | | (127) | | | Final account will also be agreed under budget. |
| Leisure & Pitches Complete on site | 106 | 50 | (56) | (52.83)% | | | (56) | | | | Final accounts not processed. |
| Various Projects | 92 | 34 | (58) | (63.04)% | | | | | (58) | | |
| Property Assets and Facilities Management | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 68 | 8 | (60) | (88.24)% | | | (60) | | | | This budget covers multiple projects. Main slippage was on 3 projects - removal of redundant access equipment in GMB was delayed due to Planning/Historic Scotland. Sacred Heart PS kitchen canopy missed earlier school holiday slots and had to be Easter. Greenock cemetery Garage has taken a long time to get to tender with scope now agreed with client service. |
| Minor Works | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greenock Municipal Buildings Window Replacement | 150 | 10 | (140) | (93.33)% | | | | (140) | | | Delays in connection with Historic Scotland approvals for scope of works. |
| Gourock Pool Ramp and Ventilation Works | 0 | 97 | 97 | #DIV/0! | | | | | | 97 | |
| Port Glasgow Town Hall Refresh | 94 | 216 | 122 | 129.79% | | | | | | 122 | |
| Greenock Municipal Buildings - District Court Offices | 304 | 167 | (137) | (45.07)% | | | (137) | | | | Design phase behind programme. |
| Business Store | 181 | 44 | (137) | (75.69)% | | (137) | | | | | Scope reduced to reinstatement of shop unit only. |
| Central Library Conversion | 1,860 | 1,439 | (421) | (22.63)% | | (421) | | | | | Final project cost under budget. |
| AMP Offices Complete on site | 79 | 2 | (77) | (97.47)% | | | (77) | | | | Final accounts not processed. |
| Phase 2 - Civic Amenity | 1,238 | 1,302 | 64 | 5.17% | | | | | | 64 | |
| Phase 3 - Vehicle Maintenance Shed and Road Infrastructure | 900 | 308 | (592) | (65.78)% | (592) | | | | | | Scope of Depot Rationalisation revisited to produce savings. Project delayed as a result. |
| Kim Drive Civic Amenity Site | 464 | 0 | (464) | (100.00)% | (464) | | | | | | Project delayed pending budget decision. Final decision still required on scope of works (if any). |
| Various Projects | 1,194 | 1,176 | (18) | (1.51)% | | | | | (18) | | |
| TOTAL Environment & Regeneration | 17,900 | 14,589 | (3,311) | (18.50)% | (1,257) | (753) | (1,324) | (637) | (235) | 895 | |

| | Approved Budget 2014/15 £000's | Draft 2014/15 Final Outturn £000's | Slippage from Approved Budget £000's | Slippage from Approved Budget %age | 1 Policy Decision £000's | 2 Project Cost Reduced £000's | 3 Internal Slippage £000's | 4 Delay involving 3rd Party £000's | 5 Minor Slippage £000's | 6 Accelerated Projects | Comments |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Education & Lifelong Learning | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-SEMP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education (Non-SEMP) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whinhill/Kilmacolm/St Ninian's PS - Pitch Upgrading | 799 | 473 | (326) | (40.80)% | | | (326) | | | | Project phasing now aligns with major refurbishment in later years. |
| Various Projects | 0 | 49 | 49 | #DIV/0! | | | | | | 49 | |
| Safer Communities | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scheme of Assistance | 1308 | 1093 | (215) | (16.44)% | | | | (215) | | | Delay in RCH programme/ owner occupier grant uptake. |
| Watt Complex Refurbishment | 153 | 1 | (152) | (99.35)% | | | | (152) | | | CMT have agreed appointment of consultant to progress fresh HLF bid. |
| Inverkip Community Facility & Library Fit Out | 1200 | 83 | (1,117) | (93.08)% | | | | (1,117) | | | Complications with Purchase of Land / SEPA approval of drainage / ongoing consultant dialogue. Tender report produced 25th May - over budget by @£360k - report to P&R August |
| Various Projects | 27 | 74 | 47 | 174.07% | | | | | | 47 | |
| TOTAL Education & Lifelong Learning (excl School) | 3,487 | 1,773 | (1,714) | (49.15)% | 0 | 0 | (326) | (1,484) | 0 | 96 | |
| SEMP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demolish Greenock Academy | 0 | 150 | 150 | #DIV/0! | | | | | | 150 | |
| Ardgowan PS Refurbishment & Extension | 3,134 | 4882 | 1,748 | 55.78% | | | | | | 1,748 | |
| St Patricks PS New Build | 215 | 123 | (92) | (42.79)% | | | | (92) | | | Hub project cash flow differs from traditional fee profiling with less paid at various stages. |
| St John's PS - Refurbishment & Extension | 1,059 | 831 | (228) | (21.53)% | | | (228) | | | | Project started on site later than original projection due to delay in design stage. Contractor progress also slow over the early part of the contract (winter - started December 2014). |
| Kilmacolm PS - Refurbishment | 145 | 56 | (89) | (61.38)% | | | | (89) | | | Hub project cash flow differs from traditional fee profiling with less paid at various stages. |
| Early Years (C&YPB - 600 Hrs + 2 yr olds) | 413 | 124 | (289) | (69.98)% | | | (289) | | | | Delay linked to St John's project above - £375K funding from this budget. |
| Balance of Lifecycle Fund | 487 | 378 | (109) | (22.38)% | | | (109) | | | | Multiple projects through this budget. Various reasons including weather related issues. |
| Balance of Contingency | 59 | 0 | (59) | (100.00)% | | (59) | | | | | Capital programme contingency not fully allocated. |
| Complete on site | 1,699 | 1108 | (591) | (34.79)% | | | (591) | | | | Final accounts not processed. |
| Various Projects | 140 | 104 | (36) | (25.71)% | | | | | (36) | | |
| TOTAL SEMP | 7,351 | 7,756 | 405 | 5.51% | 0 | (59) | (1,217) | (181) | (36) | 1,898 | |
| Health & Social Care Committee | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Neil Street Childrens Home Replacement | 0 | 114 | 114 | #DIV/0! | | | | | | 114 | |
| Various Projects | 195 | 161 | (34) | (17.44)% | | | | | (34) | | |
| Total Health & Social Care | 195 | 275 | 80 | 41.03% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (34) | 114 | |
| Council Total | 29,722 | 25,166 | (4,556) | (15.33)% | (1,257) | (907) | (2,867) | (2,302) | (385) | 3,162 | |
| %age Variation | | | | | (4.23)% | (3.05)% | (9.65)% | (7.75)% | (1.30)% | 10.64% | |

Summary of Reported Slippage by Period

Appendix 3

| | <u>Sept'14 - Period 4</u> | | <u>Nov'14 - Period 6</u> | | <u>Feb'15 - Period 8</u> | | <u>March'15 - Period 9</u> | | <u>May'15 - Period 11</u> | | <u>Outturn</u> | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| | <u>£000's</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>£000's</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>£000's</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>£000's</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>£000's</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>£000's</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Policy & Resources | (39) | (4.9)% | (39) | (4.9)% | (39) | (4.9)% | (39) | (4.9)% | (68) | (8.6)% | 16 | 2.0% |
| Environment, Regeneration & Resources | 1,728 | 9.6% | 1,700 | 9.4% | 1,918 | 10.7% | 2,550 | 14.3% | 2,942 | 16.4% | 3,311 | 18.5% |
| Education & Lifelong Learning | 1,435 | 41.2% | 1,485 | 42.6% | 1,251 | 35.9% | 1,363 | 39.1% | 1,718 | 49.3% | 1,714 | 49.2% |
| School Estate | - | 0.0% | 715 | 9.1% | 625 | 7.9% | 625 | 8.5% * | 167 | 2.3% | (405) | (5.5)% |
| Health & Social Care | - | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 25 | 12.8% | 10 | 5.1% | (80) | (41.0)% |
| Total | 3,124 | 10.3% | 3,861 | 12.7% | 3,755 | 12.4% | 4,524 | 15.2% | 4,769 | 16.1% | 4,556 | 15.3% |

| | <u>Movement Nov'14</u> <u>(Period 6) v Outturn</u> | | <u>2013/14 Comparator</u> <u>Movement Nov'13</u> <u>(Period 6) v Outturn</u> | | <u>Movement 2013/14 to</u> <u>2014/15</u> | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-------------|--|--------------|--|---------------|
| | <u>£000's</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>£000's</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>£000's</u> | <u>%</u> |
| Policy & Resources | 55 | 7.0% | 116 | 9.6% | (61) | (2.6)% |
| Environment, Regeneration & Resources | 1,611 | 9.1% | 4,098 | 28.9% | (2,487) | (19.9)% |
| Education & Lifelong Learning | 229 | 6.6% | 872 | 37.6% | (643) | (31.0)% |
| School Estate | (1,120) | (14.6)% | (379) | (1.8)% | (741) | (12.8)% |
| Health & Social Care | (80) | (41.0)% | 158 | 86.3% | (238) | (127.4)% |
| Total | 695 | 2.6% | 4,865 | 12.5% | (4,170) | (9.9)% |