

CALL CENTRE OPTIONS BEYOND 2012 (Report by the Head of Information Management)

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to present recommendations regarding the options for the Call Centre beyond December 2012 for consideration by Cabinet on September 22nd, 2011.

2. INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. The main IT contracts for the Call Centre end in December 2012, the Speke House lease runs until June 2013. The Council has been looking at what is required to deal with this issue.
- 2.2. The Council set up the current Call Centre operation in 2005. The service is managed and staffed entirely by HDC personnel but the accommodation, core IT and telephony infrastructure is provided by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC).
- 2.3. The Customer Relationship Management System (CRM) is Onyx One Serve – This system is used to record the details of customer contacts (via phone, web and eforms), maintaining customer records and history. The system is used to record and generate Service Requests for the back office to action as well as providing various management reports.
- 2.4. The telephony system is Avaya which is an Automated Call Distribution (ACD) system. This system provides all of the intelligent and automated routing, queuing, call recording, messaging and reporting functionality. The Council pay CCC a managed service and support fee for the current infrastructure.
- 2.5. The Call Centre occupies leased accommodation in Speke House (A CCC owned building that also houses their call centre, Cambs Direct) in St Ives.
- 2.6. A project to formally evaluate the Council's future options for the Call Centre was initiated in February 2011. The Project Board is chaired by Chris Hall, Head of IMD with Julia Barber, Head of Customer Services also a member.

3. OBJECTIVES

- 3.1. The primary objectives of the project are :
 - a. To evaluate the main options for HDC's Call Centre to enable decisions to be taken in advance of the expiry of the current contracts with CCC (Dec 2012 and June 2013).

- b. To consider the options on the basis of maintaining or improving high levels of service against overall value.
- c. Identify opportunities to find savings and reduce cost.
- d. To explore the benefits of sharing elements of the service provision and / or collaboration with existing and / or new LA partners.

These objectives have been applied to some specific areas:

- i. *Reviewing Technology (CRM and Telephony)*
- ii. *Call Centre Location*
- iii. *Staff options*
- iv. *Reviewing CCC's service offer*

4. OPTIONS

The table below highlights the main options that exist for the Call Centre and whether they have been evaluated (denoted by the ticks and crosses) and the reasoning:

	Share with CCC	HDC Provided	Share with FDC / SCDC	Cambs Direct (CCC)
Staff	✘ Option N/A - CCC has its own Call Centre - Cambs Direct. Only viable option to collaborate on staff is outsourcing to Cambs Direct	✔ Existing position - All Call Centre staff employed directly by HDC	✘ Option not currently considered - SCDC part of Cambs Direct and FDC have no known intention to share	✔ Option evaluated - Indicative figures received for Cambs Direct to offer the service. If moving to Cambs Direct the whole service would be outsourced
Telephony	✔ Existing position - HDC use CCC's Avaya ACD system	✔ Option evaluated - HDC could move to providing its own ACD system.	✘ Option not currently considered - Most viable options are either sharing with CCC as current or HDC only.	
CRM	✔ Existing position - HDC use CCC's Onyx CRM system	✔ Option evaluated - HDC could have its own CRM system.	✔ Option being considered - HDC could share procurement and / or a system with FDC / SCDC. More detail required to fully evaluate	
Location	✔ Existing position - HDC lease space in Speke House	✔ Option evaluated - HDC could potentially move to HDC accommodation at PFH / EFH.	✘ Option not currently considered – SCDC decision to set up its own operation at Cambourne post Dec 2012. FDC has no known plans to move from its current approach.	

5. KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The table below summarises the key conclusions for the different options that have been evaluated those that are not in scope are greyed out. More explanation and detail is provided from 5.1 onwards.

	Share with CCC	HDC	Share with FDC / SCDC	Cambs Direct (CCC)
Staff	<p>✘ N/A - Not considered a viable option. CCC has a much bigger operation with Cambs Direct and we provide different services.</p>	<p>☑ HDC has an excellent Call Centre and should retain its own staff.</p> <p>? See section 5.4 for more detail. The potential for efficiencies and improvements through the co-location of staff is limited. The resourcing of the CSC and the Call Centre can be considered separately to decisions regarding contracts with CCC.</p>	<p>✘ N/A - Option not currently considered - SCDC part of Cambs Direct and planning to set up its own operation. FDC have no known intention to share.</p>	<p>☑ Outsourcing to Cambs Direct may provide savings however confidence is low in the indicative costs provided by CCC.</p> <p>✘ Outsourcing to Cambs Direct could mean risking the current levels of excellent service passing control to CCC.</p> <p>✘ SCDC have decided to pull out of Cambs Direct to set up its own operation - This must attach severe risk to any move for HDC to go this way.</p>
Telephony	<p>☑ HDC currently uses CCC's Avaya ACD (Automated Call Distribution) telephony system and is very satisfied with it. The Avaya system is a "best in class" solution and the charge from CCC is considered to be good value (largely driven by CCC's economies of scale).</p> <p>☑ Due to CPSN data link HDC should be able to utilise the system regardless of location</p>	<p>✘ To procure and implement an HDC system will be costly (Capital of £40k+), incur risk and is unlikely to provide the call centre with a system that is either as good or cheaper than CCC's Avaya.</p>	<p>✘ N/A – Option not considered viable.</p>	
CRM	<p>See section 5.6 for details. In summary:</p> <p>☑ The current system (Onyx) has worked satisfactorily for the Call Centre.</p>	<p>See section 5.6 for details. In summary:</p> <p>☑ The business case to move to a new HDC CRM is</p>	<p>See section 5.6 for details. In summary:</p> <p>☑ SCDC have decided to end their agreement with</p>	

	Share with CCC	HDC	Share with FDC / SCDC	Camb Direct (CCC)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ CCC have indicated the running costs are likely to reduce. ✗ There are issues with the current model of sharing Onyx with CCC (Integration, constraints on configuration, not really used outside of the Call Centre). ✗ The revenue costs are considered high (£87k pa currently and £56k pa indicative in the future). ✗ CCC have no firm plans to review / replace Onyx although it is inevitable they will have to do this at some point. ✗ There are now better products available which could provide greater value to HDC as a whole. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> positive with an estimated £50k saving per year. ✓ There are now better products available which could provide greater value to HDC as a whole. ✓ Constraints imposed by the current arrangements with CCC would be removed. ✗ Any procurement and implementation project will carry complexity and risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camb Direct with CCC and set up their own Call Centre. Indications are that collaboration on procurement and/or sharing a system is possible. ✓ FDC are also reviewing its CRM options. The option to collaborate is possible. ✗ The requirements and timescales of SCDC and / or FDC may not link to HDC's. ✗ The business case for sharing systems is not yet clear. HDC has already encountered some issues sharing with CCC. ✗ Working with partners can bring additional complexity, effort and risk. 	
Location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Speke House provides good accommodation and facilities at a competitive rate. ✓ Speke House provides additional disaster recovery resilience and contingency. ✓ CCC have indicated options for continued use beyond June 2013 will be available. ✓ Option to stay at Speke for further 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The most appropriate HDC location to accommodate the Call Centre is EFH. ✓ Moving the Call Centre to PFH may provide some additional but limited scope to get efficiencies from the co-location of Call Centre and CSC staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✗ N/A - Option not currently considered – SCDC decision to set up its own operation at Cambourne post Dec 2012. FDC has no known plans to move from its current approach. 	

	Share with CCC	HDC	Share with FDC / SCDC	Cambis Direct (CCC)
	<p>years will be at worst same cost as option to move to HDC with lower risks.</p> <p>✘ Although not considered a viable strategy the dynamic interchanging of CSC and Call Centre staff would not be possible.</p>	<p>✘ Moving the Call Centre to PFH / EFH could risk sub-let income of £30k to £50k.</p> <p>✘ Moving the Call Centre to an HDC location will incur cost, complexity and risk. Staff turnover is likely to increase significantly in the short term.</p> <p>? Further clarity will be needed around the impact of the County wide MAC (Making Assets Count) project</p>		

The following lists in more detail the key findings and conclusions from the work to date by category:

5.1. Service

The HDC Call Centre continues to provide an excellent service (as endorsed by the Government's Customer Service Excellence Award and feedback from customers) and the Council retains a high degree of control over service delivery through the current model. Any future changes to the Call Centre should take into consideration the success and efficiency of the current operation against the need to generate savings.

5.2. Costs / Savings

- a. From the details established to date there is a high likelihood that savings against the Call Centre's current revenue costs will be achievable. Indicative savings are estimated in the range of **£30k pa to £50k+pa**. The savings potential is driven by CCC's own plans to reduce costs (from changes to current supplier contracts and staffing) and the option for HDC to provide its own CRM (reducing the reliance on CCC to provide support services and levy a managed service fee).
- b. Indicative costs from CCC suggest that moving the provision of our Call Centre services to Cambs Direct (and no longer having HDC staff deliver the service) could extend the savings further. However the accuracy of these indicative costs is not considered to be high (CCC acknowledge this as more detail is required). In light of points 5.1 and 5.7 this option has to be considered a high risk and not a preferred option.

5.3. Location

- a. The Council's Estates Manager has advised that the current terms of HDC's lease for Speke House are highly competitive. HDC currently pay £20k pa for rental and approx £20k for services (utilities, parking etc.)
- b. CCC has indicated space at Speke House will remain available to HDC beyond the current lease and they are willing to discuss both an extension and changes to the current arrangements (CCC has indicated that the terms of our current lease are unlikely to alter significantly).
- c. Moving the Call Centre to HDC accommodation in Huntingdon will incur elements of cost, complexity and risk. The main components being:
 - **Telephony** - The need to retain or replace CCC's ACD system.
 - **Staff** - Implications for the retention of staff (especially part time staff who live in St Ives) and service disruption. The indications are that **20% to 25%** of the Call Centre's current team may choose to leave rather than commute.
 - **DR** - Reduction in Disaster Recovery options (Speke House has back up generators and gives greater resilience through multiple town locations).
 - **Risk** - The overall resources, costs and risks associated with undertaking the project required to deliver the move.

- **Sub-let** - The opportunity cost of reducing the sub-let potential of HDC space (Work by the Facilities Team has indicated that office space above the Civic Suite, Pathfinder House (PFH) has a sub let value of **£30k pa to £50k pa**).
- d. The Facilities team believe Eastfield House (EFH) would be the most appropriate HDC location for the Call Centre if it were to move, however subletting space at PFH and other plans could mean there is no suitable space at EFH. Further clarity will be needed around the impact of the County wide MAC (Making Assets Count) project, the approach to use of HDC owned space versus income opportunities and the future shape of the organisation.
- e. A table in Appendix 2 summarises the estimated net costs of the main options. When all of the factors are taken into account the 5 year costs and risks make remaining at Speke House the preferable option.

5.4. Customer Service Staff Resource Models

There is a view that co-locating the Call Centre with our Customer Service Centre will generate management / staff efficiencies. Some Authorities do operate in this way (and many others have multiple sites including dedicated Call Centres) however the following should be noted:

- a. A change in approach to management within Customer Services is not considered to be exclusive to the Call Centre and Customer Service Centre being co-located. Speke House is only 5/6 miles from PFH and EFH (Considered as the best HDC alternative to Speke) is 2 miles from PFH.
- b. Through accurately forecasting calls, good staff planning and using part time staff the Call Centre is already efficient with little spare capacity. In addition the current make up of skills sets, preferences and training / knowledge is not uniform across the Call Centre and CSC staff. The opportunity to create efficiencies through interchanging staff dynamically on the same site is therefore considered limited.
- c. The opportunity for greater cross training / movement of staff between the channels could still be beneficial, (As recently demonstrated for maternity cover). Practice from elsewhere (for example East Riding) does suggest the option to use face to face staff as an additional (but planned) resource for taking calls could be explored and has no dependency on co-location.
- d. Changes to the approach for staffing and managing both face to face and phone contacts are not dependent upon the co-location of these services. It is not constrained by the contracts and timescales for agreements with CCC.

5.5. Technology - Telephony

- a. The HDC Call Centre currently uses CCC's Avaya ACD (Automated Call Distribution) telephony system and is very satisfied with it. The Avaya system is a "best in class" solution and the charge from CCC is considered to be good value (largely driven by CCC's economies of scale).

- b. Moving away from this system to procure and implement an HDC system will be costly (Capital of **£40k+**), incur risk and is unlikely to provide the call centre with a system that is either as good or cheaper than CCC's Avaya.
- c. The agreement for this should be extended in line with the term for Speke House. Approval should be given to the Project Team (supported by Legal / Estates and Facilities as required), to initiate negotiations with CCC.

5.6. Technology - CRM

- a. Surprisingly CCC has no plans to review the CRM market place and is committed to retaining the Onyx system with a planned upgrade to version 7.1 during 2011/12. To date CCC and therefore also HDC have only limited information about the features and any benefits of the new version. While there are no confirmed plans it does seem inevitable that CCC will have to review their options at some point in the future. Recently (Aug 2011) contact from CCC has indicated their position maybe subject to change – although HDC has no official confirmation of this.
- b. HDC's use of the CCC hosted Onyx system has been a mainly satisfactory arrangement for the last 6 years and supports the Call Centre functionally. However there are a number of issues:
 - Integration with other HDC systems and datasets – Through a combination of Onyx residing on CCC's network and the Onyx architecture this has proved to be an area that is both costly and difficult to achieve. In addition gaining full access directly to HDC systems has also proved difficult.
 - Configuration and changes to the system are wholly controlled by CCC. While HDC pay for CCC to undertake this on our behalf, the constraints that exist and overall value is open to question. CCC has indicated these costs are likely to reduce (From **£87k pa to £56k pa**).
 - Our LLPG interface to Onyx for daily property record updates has recently ceased with no firm plans to rectify this (an area of investment in the past). This is due to a change in LLPG file format which CCC / Consona (Onyx vendor) do not view as a priority.
 - The revenue costs of £87k pa are considered high - they include a managed service fee as well as funding for a post in CCC's Business Support Team.
 - It is used very little by Services and other customer service channels (Face to face, no web or self service options).
 - Reporting and access to HDC data in the CRM. The current arrangements could be significantly improved.
- c. The conclusions of the evaluation of the CRM market place for local government undertaken with South Cambs District Council (SCDC) and Fenland District Council (FDC) are listed below:
 - There are significantly better products than the current version of Onyx we are using. The current system is used nearly exclusively by the Call Centre, it is believed an alternative CRM from the review could be utilised far more corporately (inc other customer service channels) and would provide a better strategic fit for HDC's IT infrastructure and resources.

- This combined with bringing the CRM under greater HDC control (i.e. no longer taking the service from CCC), could also result in a more agile, easier integrated and better utilised system.
- The future estimated costs of the options based upon indicative costs from CRM vendors and CCC are summarised below (A more detailed breakdown is provided in Appendix 1). The estimated return on investment from switching systems and the potential for ongoing revenue savings presents a sound business case. An MTP proposal has been drafted on this basis and is included in Appendix 3. This shows an annual saving of - **£50k pa**.

Option	Cap (£k)	Rev (£k pa)	Total 5 years (£k)	Future Revenue Saving £k pa
Current Costs for CCC Onyx	0	87	435	0
Future Costs for CCC Onyx	0	56	280	-30
Preferred CRM option from Market Review	156	16	236	-71

- d. After working together with FDC and SCDC to review the CRM market place, all three Councils (on the basis of those representing them) believe there is some potential to explore further whether or not the options of joint procurement, or some degree of sharing a CRM system are mutually beneficial.
- e. PC hardware, support and data connectivity at Speke House – At the moment the PCs and direct support for them is provided by CCC (£9k pa). There is a data link to HDC which gives limited access to HDC’s network and systems. Data connectivity options between HDC and CCC locations will be improved by the introduction of CPSN¹ during 2012. The option to retain the current arrangements or replace the PC hardware (and support) and bring them directly onto the HDC network requires further investigation.
- f. As part of any future procurement the various routes / options will need to be evaluated alongside discussions with partners. The overall timescales and associated risks will need to be considered. The option to retain the use of CCC’s CRM would remain open until that process has concluded.

5.7. Developments at South Cambs District Council

- a. SCDC’s Cabinet have approved (July 2011) that they end their current arrangements with Cambs Direct and set up their own contact centre (at the end of their contract in Dec 2012). It is not known exactly what the full implications of this will be for CCC and if there will be any consequently, for HDC – but if CCC are losing a client, there may be a risk this loss of income will be passed onto HDC.

¹ (CPSN –A County wide data and communications network linking public sector buildings, offices, schools etc)

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Cabinet are asked to approve the following recommendations:

6.1. Staff

- a. The Council should retain an HDC operated and staffed Call Centre beyond Dec 2012.

6.2. Location

- a. Approval is given to the Project Team (supported by Legal / Estates and Facilities as required), to initiate negotiations with CCC regarding a 3 year extension to the lease of space / facilities at Speke House. This process should be planned to conclude no later than June 2012.

6.3. CRM Technology

- a. The Project Team commence a formal procurement process for a replacement CRM system. The timescale for the completion of this process is estimated as January 2012.
- b. The Project Team continue discussions with SCDC and FDC regarding any possible collaboration on procurement or sharing of technology (To be considered with recommendation 6.3 a).
- c. The Project Team continue to communicate and monitor CCC's position prior to any final decision.
- d. On the basis that the cost of the future CRM system is anticipated to be at worst cost neutral (and more likely will generate a saving), Cabinet is requested to delegate the final decision on future CRM options to COMT and the Executive Councillor for Customer Services.

6.4. Telephony System

- a. It is recommended that the Call Centre retains and extends agreements for the use of CCC's Avaya ACD system.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND CONTACTS

Matt Hinton – Team Leader, BA and Projects Team, IMD, ☎ Ext 8196

Chris Hall – Head of IMD, ☎ Ext 8116

Julia Barber – Head of Customer Services, ☎ Ext 8105

APPENDIX 1 - CRM INDICATIVE PRICE COMPARISON - SOFT MARKET REVIEW MAY / JUNE 2011, HDC / FDC / SCDC

	Option 1 £k	Option 2 £k	Option 3 £k	Option 4 £k	Future CCC Onyx v7 ² £k	Current CCC Onyx £k
Front Office Licensing - 50 license	28.5	54	36	25	0	0
Back Office - 35 licenses	13	4	0	0	0	0
Licensing Sub Total	41.5	58	36	25		
Mail / SMS	4	13	0	10	0	0
Web	2.5	30	n/a	5.4	na	na
Integration - Typical per system	4	5		3		
Scripting tool	0	33	0	0	0	0
Campaigns	0	n/a	n/a	3.5	na	na
Reporting	0	25	0	5	0	0
Total software and modules	52	164	36	52	0	0
Estimated HDC Network Costs etc	10	10	10	10	0	0
Estimated HDC Resource Costs	20	20	20	20	0	0
Total HDC - £k	30	30	30	30	0	0
Training	8	45	0	0	0	0
Implementation Services	66	60	7	33	0	0
Services Sub Total	74	105	7	33	0	0
TOTAL - IMPLEMENTATION (less support)	156	299	73	115	0	0
Direct Support - revenue £k pa	12	38	12	10.5	56	87
Additional HDC Support - revenue £k pa	4	4	4	4	0	0

^{2 2} While no cost has been included we are awaiting a response from CCC ref the future IT network hardware refresh costs for our continuing use of Onyx. It is quite likely HDC will need to contribute financially to this if extending the current arrangements.

TOTAL - 5 years (Implementation + support 5 yrs)	236	508	153	187	280	435
---	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

APPENDIX 2 CALL CENTRE LOCATION OPTIONS – INDICATIVE COSTS

OPTION	REVENUE COSTS		CAPITAL COSTS								NET £k (5 years)	RISK (0 to 5)
	SPACE £k pa (2)	TELEPHONY SYSTEM REV £k pa	TELEPHONY - CAP £k	ADDITIONAL STAFF RECRUITMENT £k (RESULT OF INCREASED TURNOVER)	MOVE / ASSEMBLE FURNITURE £k (1)	TRAINING ROOM FACILITIES £k (Access to dedicated ACD, handsets and PCs)	ADDITIONAL SPACE MODIFICATIONS £k	NETWORK SET UP / CONFIG ETC £k (4)	HDC PROJECT MGT / SERVICES £k			
SPEKE HOUSE - EXISTING TELEPHONY	40	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240	1
HDC PFH - EXISTING TELEPHONY (3)	30	11	17	8	7	6	Cost tbc	Cost tbc	6	6	249	4
HDC EFH - EXISTING TELEPHONY (3)	30	11	17	8	7	6	Cost tbc	Cost tbc	6	6	249	3
HDC PFH - NEW HDC TELEPHONY	30	8	36	8	7	6	Cost tbc	Cost tbc	12	12	259	5
HDC EFH - NEW HDC TELEPHONY	30	8	36	8	7	6	Cost tbc	Cost tbc	12	12	259	4

1 - Estimate validated by Facilities as reasonable, actual cost tbc. This assumes current call centre furniture can be reused.

2 - Speke House actual costs (£20K for rental & £20k for services inc access to training facilities and parking spaces) for HDC opportunity cost of lower range sublet value estimate used (Advised by Accountancy as most appropriate figure).

3 - Estimate based upon indicative figures from CCC and assumes data / network connectivity via CPSN link is in place. (CPSN –A County wide data and communications network provided by Virgin Media linking public sector buildings, offices, schools etc)

4 - Note - PC refresh costs / build, assumes cost will be net £0 as if staying or moving will need to be undertaken

APPENDIX 3 DRAFT MTP

NEW SCHEME OR VARIATION IN COST		REF									
Bid Title	Call Centre - CRM Replacement										
Lead Head of Service	Julia Barber										
Brief Description of Bid clarify whether new scheme or variation on an existing bid	New Scheme - Detailed report going to COMT (Aug), O & S (Sept 8th) and Cabinet (Sept 22nd). Recommendation to procure HDC replacement for current use of CCC Onyx CRM. All costs are indicative at this stage, and require a formal procurement process to occur - this may change the profile										
PROPOSED START YEAR	HIGH PRIORITY, UNAVOIDABLE or SAVING	FULL YEAR IMPACT (VARIATION)									
2012	HIGH PRIORITY / SAVING	-52									
IF UNAVOIDABLE, WHY?											
IF HIGH PRIORITY or SAVING, WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON THE COUNCIL'S PRIORITIES?											
Which Priority Area(s)?	What measure(s) will be affected?	What impact do you expect this scheme to have on the measure(s) & in what timescale?									
Alternatives What alternatives have you considered to achieve similar outcomes and why are they not as cost effective?	Soft market review has happened, this has included getting updated costs from CCC for the continuation of the current service with them. The recommended option of pursuing formal procurement is, at this stage, thought likely to create the greatest saving										
Key Assumptions made Including the period for any non-permanent revenue bids, usage, charging policy, staffing etc.											
Risk Assessment What are the risks and likelihood of the impact quoted above or the financial assessment not being achieved?	The costs we have are from indicative soft market testing, and will be firmed up by commencing formal procurement and revisiting the business case once this is complete. We will still be able to stop the procurement at that point and continue our relationship with CCC should this not yield the anticipated savings.										
EXTRA COST OR SAVING (£000)											
	Pre 2011/12	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	Post 2016/17	Total		
Gross Capital Cost	0	20	136	0	0	0	0	0	156		
Capital Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Capital Variation	0	20	136	0	0	0	0	0	156		
of whichinflation									0		
cap fees									0		
other	0	20	136	0	0	0	0	0	156		
Expenditure		0	-20	-158	-158	-158	-158	-87			
Income		0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Net Revenue Variation	0	0	-20	-158	-158	-158	-158	-87			
of whichinflation											
cap fees											
other		0	-20	-158	-158	-158	-158	-87			
Memo overall impact FYE**									-52		
TOTAL COST OF PROPOSED SCHEME (£000)											
Sources of External funding											
Conditional Scheme can only go ahead if received											
Possible											
Considered and discounted											
ALL INCOME NEEDS "-" SIGN	Pre 2011/12	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	Post 2016/17	Total	LIFE years	
	Cash prices		Outurn 2012/13								
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE											
Land									0		
New Buildings									0		
Improvements to Buildings									0		
New infrastructure									0		
Improvements to Infrastructure									0		
Vehicles									0		
Equipment/Computer Hardware			10						10	5	
Software		20	126						146	5	
	0	20	136	0	0	0	0	0	156	5	
CAPITAL INCOME											
Earmarked Capital Receipt									0		
Grant or contribution									0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NET CAPITAL	0	20	136	0	0	0	0	0	156	5	
REVENUE											
Expenditure				-71	-71	-71	-71				
Income											
NET REVENUE	0	0	0	-71	-71	-71	-71	0			
Memo overall impact FYE**										35	