

PORTFOLIO: ENVIRONMENT

BEST VALUE REVIEW OF THE COMMERCIAL SERVICES DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report, produced by the self-assessment team, informs members and others about the Service itself, the process used to undertake the review and its outcomes. Importantly, it seeks approval to an Action Plan for continuous improvement over the next five years.
- 1.2 The report draws on inputs from the self-assessment team, customers, stakeholders, members and the Best Value Board.
- 1.3 This report is a summary of a full 90 page review document, which is available should any officer or member wish to see it. The links between statements made in the review and the action plan are highlighted in the report.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF KEY OUTCOMES

- 2.1 Review of costs and savings
 - 2.1.1 The overall current cost of the Service is £671,000
 - 2.1.2 The overall cost of the review is £23,750
 - 2.1.3 Efficiency Improvements of £13,450 have been recommended, based on employee equivalent costs

2.2 Challenge

2.2.1 Nearly all the Services carried out by the Group are mandatory requirements imposed upon local government by statute; the only real areas for discretion being the provision of education courses and health promotion, which, overall, account for less than two percent of the group's time. The manner by which the statutory functions are carried out is becoming increasingly prescriptive. For example, the Food Standards Agency and, more recently, the Health and Safety Commission, determine inspection targets and monitor performance to encourage consistency and compliance with national standards. This degree of control even extends to the statistical returns required and to the level of qualifications held by enforcement officers. Failure to fulfill these criteria can result in serious financial implications for the Council.

- 2.2.2. Scope exists to contract out some of the statutory Services; the four options cited in the review range from retaining all Services in-house, to contracting out either all or part of the inspections. The favoured option for several years now has been to use external contractors for inspection of food hygiene premises. This has allowed us to meet Government Inspection targets despite staff shortages. These external inspectors are generally unwilling to undertake follow up enforcement duties should the premise that they inspect fall below the statutory requirements. This is due to the considerable time taken to undertake this work, and its unpredictability.
- 2.2.3 The very specialised nature of the majority of the work undertaken by the Group restricts the scope of anyone other than Environmental Health Officers being able to undertake the full range of functions and duties, especially in the area of food hygiene enforcement, where the minimum levels of qualifications needed are determined by central government.
- 2.2.4 The Licensing Service was recently transferred to the Group from what was formerly the Chief Executives Directorate. No other Services delivered by other parts of the Council have been identified as work that could be undertaken by the Group.
- 2.2.5 Research has failed to find an external provider who is able/willing to deliver the whole of the Group's Service. The Chief Environmental Health Officers Group have examined this issue at a wider level. All Environmental Health Departments carrying out reviews are facing similar problems in finding external providers. National Adverts placed by some authorities requesting expressions of interest in all or parts of the Service by the private sector have not resulted in any interest. This is mainly due to the unpredictability of the enforcement role that is necessary. However, parts of the Service can be externalised and this has already been market tested. A shortage of resources and the need to meet targets has led to the occasional employment of two external contractors to carry out food hygiene inspections on behalf of the Council. The premises they are contracted to inspect are medium to low risk in terms of food hygiene: those of a higher risk are retained for inspection in-house. The situation will be assessed at the end of the contract period as part of the review plan.
- 2.2.6 Benchmarking results across Hampshire and the Isle of Wight show this mix of service to be very cost effective for New Forest District Council. Our costs for such inspections, despite the increased travelling in the District are favourable.
- 2.2.7 For reasons relating to enforcement, the sampling functions undertaken by the Group offer limited scope for externalisation. Notwithstanding this, in partnership with Southampton Port Health Authority, part of the Group's mandatory shellfish sampling programme has been successfully contracted out to the Public Health Laboratory Service (P.H.L.S.) for the past ten years. This contract is reviewed annually. Again there are difficulties in finding suitable other external providers due to the specialist nature of the work and the economies of scale that are present due to

other coastal authorities in Hampshire using the PHLS in a similar manner.

- 2.2.8 Other partnerships are currently being developed or explored with other local authorities and external organisations in the areas of food safety enforcement, provision of health and safety training, publication of a trade newsletter and the production of a range of information leaflets for both the trade and the public. These schemes will be subject to market testing and to exploring ways of reducing production costs.
- 2.2.9 Transfer or externalisation of the functions of the Licensing Section is not a viable option: no contractor has been found to take on any part of the Service In order to carry out the functions a high degree of internal co operation is required, this is so that other statutory requirements eg Health and Safety legislation etc are not compromised. A further obstacle to this option is that legally delegated powers for licensing cannot be given to external contractors, which would mean every decision would have to be referred back to the Council. This would result in duplication of officers working on license applications. Any resulting increase in costs from externalising the Service would have to be reflected in licence fees. Furthermore, if liquor licensing were to be transferred to local authorities, the vast increase in workload without a commensurate increase in income (based on the current levels of fees set by government) would be a further disincentive to contractors.
- 2.2.10 Discretionary functions are limited to food hygiene/ health and safety promotional events and educational courses in these subjects.
- 2.2.11 Until recently these courses were organised and delivered by the Group. However, these courses were very demanding on Group's resources and not financially viable. The private sector whilst charging higher fees for the Courses also devote considerable time to promotion and selling of the various courses they run. The contractors often work on a regional or national scale and there are therefore economies of scale. Providing the courses in house diverted officers from their core functions. A partnership agreement has now been created with an external contractor, enabling the Group to offer a wider range of courses locally, whilst at the same time reducing the Group's input, particularly in terms of administration time. The arrangement has substantially reduced officers' involvement to solely lecturing; for which the contractor pays a fee. The true costs to the Council and the overall benefits of this new partnership will be analysed as part of Action Plan. They are estimated to bring about a two percent efficiency improvement (equivalent to £13,450 in employee costs)
- 2.2.12 Much of the Group's Services involve visits by officers in the field. Consequently, the large geographical area covered by the Council inevitably results in a significant amount of time and money spent travelling. Ways to reduce these two elements and further improve upon the efficiency of delivery of the Service are constantly being sought with the introduction of various initiatives: the Group is engaged in a trial home working pilot scheme, which will be evaluated in April.

- 2.2.13 Currently, inspections are generated according to risk or standard on last inspection rather than their geographical relationship to each other. Ways to reducing travelling costs will be included in the proposed review of the organisation of the district. The review will look at the workload per team, travelling per team and how the group delivers specialist projects.
- 2.2.14 Further examples of ways to improve efficiency include the introduction of an improved telephone system, and a points system to enable comparison of the individual work output of officers. The latter will also allow the more accurate assessment of workloads and effective allocation of resources.
- 2.2.15 The existing Environmental Health software package Uniform 2000 used by the Group is central to the whole running of the department. Designed round a central database of properties in the district, its purpose is to maintain information and produce reports needed by management. For a number of reasons, it is acknowledged that its full potential has not been fully developed. As we will be reducing time on other Administration, such as organising Education Courses we will be able to develop this system further. These issues are already being addressed, starting with the relaunch of the upgraded version of the package in early 2002 and the recent appointment of a specialist I.T. Administrator both providing enhanced information and more user-friendly in its application.

2.3 **Consultation**

- 2.3.1 Customer satisfaction surveys have been in operation in respect of food and health and safety inspections and food complaints for a number of years. Results are very positive. In addition the Assistant Director operates a Complaints system (in line with ISO9001) to address any issues that the public raise. The performance of the Commercial Team attracts very little criticism from the public.
- 2.3.2 Although the Customer Satisfaction surveys had not indicated any problems with existing Service delivery, it was recognised that the scope of the surveys was limited in terms of the information obtained and that wider consultation was desirable. Accordingly, a questionnaire was sent to the New Forest District Council Citizens' Panel to find out more about how the Service is perceived, its accessibility, and the level of Service wanted.
- 2.3.2 There was a 44% response rate to the questionnaire. A third of respondents had heard of each of the Group's Services. Nearly all the respondents (96%) were of the opinion that food hygiene standards should be high and an encouragingly high number (79%) thought that they already were. Whilst in general it was felt that the minimum frequency of food hygiene inspections ought to be increased, increasing the Council Tax to pay for this brought a mixed response. Overall, a Service that represented good value for money was regarded as more important than just a cheap Service.
- 2.3.4 In addition to members of the public, District Council residents, and businesses, a wider 'stakeholder' base was identified to include other

Council Services, and external organisations that interact with the Group e.g. the Police and Fire Service in order to ascertain their views on the level of Service that they would like provided. Questionnaires were sent or visits made to a representative number of these bodies. Nearly all of those that responded (98%) rated the Service good to excellent. Accessibility, delivery, reliability and level of Service all received ratings of 78% and above. Half of the respondents either acknowledged existing partnership arrangements or had ideas on developing partnership working.

- 2.3.5 An example of this partnership working is the establishment of an Events Safety Group with other interested public Services, in which the Group will have a lead role.
- 2.3.6 Forging links with the private sector has been more difficult, mainly due to the limited number of trade associations. However, involvement with the tourism sector has demonstrated the benefits of such dialogue and of extending links with external organisations. The improvement plan (parts 7 and 14) include actions on developing contact with businesses. Since the review was carried out the Service is seeking views from the Business Sector on their enforcement policy.
- 2.3.7 The staff within Commercial Services Group are also regarded as being important stakeholders and a questionnaire was distributed in an attempt to identify some of the Service's key issues that impact upon them personally. The Performance Development Interview process was generally considered satisfactory or better. Communication was an important element of the questionnaire and whilst it was seen within the Group as being good (30%) to excellent (70%), with other Council departments it was judged as only satisfactory to poor (50%). Perceived recognition of their work by senior management decreased significantly at each tier: at Line Manager and colleague level 80%, and only 30% at Director level. Staff motivation was 70%.
- 2.3.8 The Licensing Section has recently adopted the practice of sending questionnaires to licence applicants.

2.4 Compare

2.4.1 With the exception of the Licensing Section, the Group has accreditation to ISO 9001 since 1996. This internationally recognised quality system ensures a consistency in the standard of Service delivery across the breadth of Services. It is audited annually by an external assessor. This quality standard is about to undergo major review to meet European requirements; to retain accreditation will involve a year on year improvement in Service. Whilst it is intended that the schemes procedures and auditing requirements will be retained it is likely that a decision will be made as to whether to retain the external verification of this scheme in future years. The overall benefits of rewriting manuals to align with the new ISO standards must be viewed with caution.

- 2.4.2 Comparison with other local authorities has shown the Group to be equally competitive despite having the largest geographical area overall.
- 2.4.3 Initial comparison between food hygiene inspections carried out by private contractors and the Group's own officers has shown to be generally competitive. This competitiveness should improve in the Council's favour as a result of efficiency savings identified in the Best Value review of inspection.
- 2.4.4 since 1999, in association with fourteen other Local Authorities, the Group has taking part in a 'Benchmarking' comparison study in the work of the food and health and safety functions. The two-part study consisted of a comparison of non cost-based performance areas, using a quality matrix, and a time recording/costing exercise for the inspection of premises. The Group's cost for food hygiene health and safety inspections did not differ significantly from the average for Hampshire. Overall, the Council was the second highest achiever in the area of Food Safety Enforcement, and was better than average in Health and Safety Enforcement.
- 2.4.5 With other Hampshire and Isle of Wight local authorities, the Group has taken part in inter-authority auditing of the food and health and safety Services. The last audits were undertaken in 1999 and will take place again in 2002. The findings of the food audit concluded that the Group showed substantial compliance with the requirements of the relevant legislation and associated codes of practice and guidance. In addition, the Group's enforcement policy and customer satisfaction surveys were recognised as best practice.

2.5 **Compete**

- 2.5.1 There is to be extremely limited scope for competition in the area of Environmental Health covered by the Group; at present the private sector is interested only in bidding for work in the areas of inspections and providing education courses. Both areas have been exposed and the results will be subject to assessment in terms of standards and costs. The only privatised service in the Country (Westminster) has recently been reviewed. This has resulted in a decision to bring the service back in house due to cost and efficiency.
- 2.5.2 The development and efficiency of officers will be part of the review.
- 2.5.3 There is a need for a market to be developed nationally in order to comply with the sprit if Best Value. To date there is one example that we are aware of the development of a cross boarder market, again this is only in Food Hygiene inspections, we will be reviewing how this works.

2.6 **Key Review Outcomes**

Service Improvements

Twenty-four improvement areas have been identified and are listed in the 5 Year Improvement Plan For Environmental Health Commercial Services (Appendix 1)

2.7 **Sustainability**

A sustainability assessment was carried out and a number of recommendations were included within the Action Plan.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 The total cost of the Service is £671,000.
- 3.2 The cost to date of undertaking the review is as follows:

	Number of Man Hours	Employee Costs
Self Assessment Verification	950	£23,750
Other Costs	None	
Total Review Costs		£23,750

- 3.3 It is estimated that the total cost of full implementation of the Action Plan as proposed is £7,000 per annum.
- 3.4 The proposed Action Plan should result in an estimated 2 % efficiency improvement which translated into employee cost would be £13,450 resulting from the restructuring of the provision of education courses.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Sustainability Assessment undertaken by the Service has resulted in the identification of some area for improvements which will have a positive impact on the environment.
- 4.2 The main purpose of the Service is to ensure as safe an environment as possible in terms of food, occupational health and safety and licensing, and therefore the implementation of the action plan will have a positive impact on the environment.

5. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Sustainability Assessment recognises the importance of safe and secure communities.
- 5.2 This Service has no impact on the issue.

6. **CONCLUSIONS**

6.1 The review process of consulting with our stakeholders has shown that they are generally happy with the Service provided by the Group. However the review has shown that there should be greater consultation with businesses in the area.

7. **PORTFOLIO: HOLDERS COMMENTS**

7.1 The portfolio holder has seen this report and has no adverse comments.

8. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 8.1 That the Action Plan for continuous improvement of the Commercial Services Division of Environmental Health as set out in Appendix 1 be approved.
- 8.2 That those actions not requiring additional resources be implemented in accordance with the time table.
- 8.3 That those actions requiring additional resources either be met by efficiency savings, or are not implemented until sufficient budgetary provision is provided.

Review Plan.

For further information: Background Paper:

Annie Righton Assistant Director (Environmental Health) Appletree Court, Lyndhurst. Tel: 023 80285123

Email: annie.righton@nfdc.gov.uk

Derek Roe Environmental Health Manager (Commercial) Town Hall, Lymington. Tel: 023 80285685

Fax: 023 80285683

Email: derek.roe@nfdc.gov.uk

	ement Area 1 DUCTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH	WEBSITE			
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Responsibility	
		measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
A	Develop basic site	Site on line	Dec.2001 (1)	M. Robinson J. Carne IT	Within Normal Working
В	Enhance the site to include Licensing	Site on line	March 2003 (1)	M. Robinson J. Carne T Hetherington	
С	Review website and modify as necessary	Report to CSG	Annually (1)	As above	
D	Enhance the site to include Caravan Sites and Animal Welfare	Site on line	March 2003 (1)	M Robinson J. Carne A. Weldycz	

Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dat	es &	Respoi	nsibility
		measures/targets	priority lev	el	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Reduce backlog of inspections to acceptable levels	Less than 85%of total premises Less than 90% Less Than 95%	March 2003 March 2004 March 2005	(1)	Whole Team	Within Normal Working
В	Appoint Project team	Project Team appointed	March 2004	(1)	E.H.M.	
С	Identify subjects for projects and allocate to officers	Subjects Allocated	May 2004	(2)	Project Team	
D	Research topics and advise other inspectors	Teaching Completed	Aug 2004	(2)	Specialist Officers	
E	Inspect Premises	95% of Premises inspected	Dec 2004	(2)	Whole team	
F	Review method of working	Report to CSG	March 2005		E.H.M.	

	ement Area 3 V TEAM STRUCTURE				
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Respo	nsibility
	·	measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Develop structure best suited to team needs		April 2002 (1)	E.H.M. Deputy Director	Within normal working
В	Discuss new structure with team	CSG Meeting	June 2002 (1)		
С	Implement new structure	Implementation of structure	July 2002 (1)		

	ement Area 4 NALISE INSPECTIONS IF MORE COST EF	FECTIVE			
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Respo	nsibility
		measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Monitor work currently being carried out by contractors	Compare Cost Quality & Quantity	March 2003 (2)	E.H.M.	Within normal working
В	Review contractors performance	Report to EHMT	Aug 2003 (2)		
С	Implement any necessary Changes	Changes implemented	Dec 2002 (2)		

Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone da	tes &	Respo	nsibility
		measures/targets	priority lev	/el	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Identify likely candidates for award	Businesses identified	Aug 2004	(3)	Whole team	Within normal working
В	Advise and inspect businesses	Inspections completed	March 2005	(3)		
С	Issue awards	Awards Issued	April 2005	(3)		
D	Review success of scheme	Report to CSG	May 2005	(3)		

Improvement Area 6 DEVELOP PARTNERSHIPS WITH OTHER LOCAL AUTHORITIES TO EMPLOY ROVING STAFF								
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Respo	nsibility			
		measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs			
Α	Investigate the possibility of employing staff on a county wide basis	Report to EHMT	March 2003 (3)	Asst. Director	Within normal working			

	ement Area 7 ICE NEWS LETTER FOR LOCAL BUSINE	SSES IN CONJUNC	TION WITH OTHER	R LOCAL AUTHORIT	Υ
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates 8	Respo	onsibility
	·	measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Develop methodology with Test Valley	Report to CSG	March 2003 (2	E.H.M. Test Valley	Likely costs of £7,000 p.a.
В	Produce Newsletter	Half yearly production	Aug 2003 (3)		
С	Circulate Newsletter		Sept 2003 (3)		
D	Evaluate success of project	Report to CSG	March 2006 (2)		
E	Investigate the possibility of advertising within Newsletter		March 2006 (6		

	ement Area 8 /E THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COMPL	JTER DATA BASE			
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Respo	nsibility
		measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Launch new Uniform 7 after consultation with staff	Uniform Launched	July 2002 (1)	Project Team	Within normal working
В	Retrain all staff	Staff trained	Aug 2002 (1)	Admin Asst	
С	Develop parts of the program not already in use	Parts developed	March 2004 (2)	Admin Asst E.H.M.	
D	Review compliance scores over history	Report to CSG	March 2004 (3) Annually	E.H.M/	

	ement Area 9 ATE HOME WORKING PROJECT				
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Respo	nsibility
	·	measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Evaluate the pilot	Report to EHMT	Aug 2002 (2)	E.H.M. Project Team	Within normal working
В	If proved successful move to more people working from home		March 2003 (2)		
С	Review Working		April 2003 (2)		

	ement Area 10 RE COMMON TENDERING PROCEDURES	S WITH OTHER LOC	CAL AUTHORITIES		
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Respo	nsibility
		measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Explore common procedures	Report to EHMT	March 2004 (3)	Asst Director	
В	Implement where appropriate		May 2004 (3)		

	ement Area 11 HONE SYSTEM					
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Responsibility		
	·	measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs	
A	Set up telephone system to give information to the public when officer away from the telephone	System operational	When system installed (1)	Whole Team	Within normal working	

Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone da	ites &	Respo	nsibility
		measures/targets	priority lev	vel	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Develop new system	System developed	Dec 2001	(2)	E.H.M.	Within normal working
В	Introduce system	System introduced	Jan 2002	(2)		
С	Evaluate system	Report to CSG	June 2002	(2)		
D	Develop system	System modified as necessary	Dec 2002 Ongoing	(2)		

	ement Area 13 UCE TRANSLATION SERVICE FOR ETH	INIC MINORITIES			
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Responsibility	
		measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Introduce translation service on inspection where required	Service introduced	Dec 2001 (2)	Whole team	Within existing resources
В	Set up project team	Team Appointed	May 2002 (1)	E.H.M.	
С	Ensure essential leaflets etc. are translated and disseminated	Leaflets translated	March 2003 (3)	Project team	£ 2,000

Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dat	es &	Respo	nsibility
	·	measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs	
Α	Meet with the various business organisations	Major organisations contacted	March 2004	(2)	E.H.M.	Within normal working
В	Implement agreed changes	Changes made	April 2004	(2)		
С	Investigate viability of business briefings	Report to CSG	April 2005	(2)	E.H.M.	

Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Responsibility	
		measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Establish group	Group established	March 2002 (2)	D. Jordan T. Hetherington	Within normal working
В	Monitor effectiveness of group	Report to EHMT	Annually (1)	E.H.M.	

	ement Area 16 MARKING				
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance M	Milestone dates &	Responsibility	
	·	measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Analyse results of central cost and overheads and implement necessary changes	Report to EHMT	March 2003 (2)	Asst Director E.H.M.	Within normal working
В	Analyse results of licensing	Report to EHMT	March 2003 (2)	E.H.M. T Hetherington	
С	Implement any necessary changes	Changes Implemented	March 2004 (2)		

Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone da	tes &	Respo	onsibility
		measures/targets	rgets priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs	
Α	Review current partnership	Report to CSG	May 2003	(1)	Assist Director E.H.M	Within normal working
В	Implement any necessary changes	Changes Implemented	June 2003	(2)		

	ement Area 18 ISE OUR ACTIVITIES AND PERFORMANO	CE			
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Responsibility	
	·	measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Consult with P.R. regarding using the District Newspaper	Consultation carried out	Dec 2002 (1)	E.H.M.	Within normal working
В	Produce news items	Articles produced	Ongoing Annually (2)	Whole Team	
С	Produce a wider range of advisory and information leaflets	Leaflets produced	March 2003 (2)	Project Team	
D	Update current information leaflets		March 2003 (2)	Project Team	
E	Introduce common format for leaflets etc.	Format agreed by EHMT	March 2003 (2)	Project Team	

	ement Area 19 INTO PARTNERSHIP TO ENFORCE SHE	LLFISH LEGISLATIO	ON		
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Respo	nsibility
	·	measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Draft agreements and guidance notes	Draft produced	Dec 2001 (2)	A Harmer	Within normal working
<u>B</u>	Circulate agreements for comment	Circulated	March 2002 (2)		
С	Obtain agreement and carry out necessary authorisations	Authorisations produced	Dec 2002 (2)		

	Improvement Area 20 AMALGAMATE THE WHOLE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH IN ONE PLACE								
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Responsibility					
		measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs				
Α	Seek ways of bringing the commercial group to Lyndhurst	Report to EHMT	Ongoing (3)	Asst Director E.H.M/	Within normal working				

Improve	ement Area 21 OTIATE CONTRACTS WITH EXTERNAL S	SUPPLIERS			
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority level	Respo NFDC Officer &	nsibility Resources
				Partners	Allocation & Costs
Α	Renegotiate contracts	Reduction in costs	Annually (2)	Asst. Director EHM	Within normal working
В	Negotiate with other Hants Las with regard to information systems e.g. Barbour Index	Reduction in costs	March 2005 (3)	Asst Director EHMs	

Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Respo	nsibility
		measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
Α	Further develop partnership with East Dorset with regard to Caravan Sites	Report to CSG	March 2003 (3)	SEHO	Within normal working

	Improvement 23 INVESTIGATE FURTHER WAYS OF REDUCING TRAVELLING								
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance	Milestone dates &	Responsibility					
	,	measures/targets	priority level	NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs				
A	Investigate ways of reducing travelling costs. i.e. joint inspections, homeworking	Reduction in costs	March 2006 (3)	Project Team	Within normal working				

Improvement 24 CONSULT WITH STAKEHOLDERS TO GAUGE PROGRESS					
Ref	Proposed Activities	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority level	Responsibility	
				NFDC Officer & Partners	Resources Allocation & Costs
A	Consult with stakeholders	Report to CSG	March 2004 (1) March 2006 (1)	ЕНМ	Within normal working

DR/ImpPlan - Jan01