

APPENDIX 1 Summary of Options and MPA/MPS responses (4 Areas where there are issues are highlighted in bold).

Chapter	Questions	Police Change Before damping	Worst Case Scenario	MPA/MPS response	Common Ground	GLA/London Councils/Response
Chapter 3 Adults' Personal Social Services	1 Do you agree that we should update the Low Income Adjustment	-£0.5m	-£0.5m	Not Supported	Yes	Not Supported
Chapter 4 Police	2 Do you agree the activity analysis should be updated and a three year average used instead of the current two year average (POL1)?	£0.6m	-	Supported	Yes	GLA is awaiting Police response
	3 Do you agree that the log of weighted bars per 100 hectares indicator should be used in place of log of bars per 100 hectares indicator (POL2)?	-£2.0m	-£2.0m	Not Supported	Yes	
	4 Do you agree that the three elements of Additional Rule 2 Grant mentioned in Chapter 4 'Police' paragraph 19 should be rolled into Principal Formula Police Grant (Main Grant) and therefore distributed as through the Police Allocation Formula (POL3)?	£4.8m	-	Not Supported (negative impact after damping of -£4.5m)	Yes	
	5 Do you agree that the whole of the Additional Rule 2 Grant mentioned in Chapter 4 'Police' paragraph 19 should be rolled into Principal Formula Police Grant (Main Grant) and therefore distributed as through the Police Allocation Formula (POL4)?	-£7.3m	-£7.3m	Not Supported (negative impact of -£1.1m after floor damping)	Yes	

Chapter	Questions		Police Change Before damping	Worst Case Scenario	MPA/MPS response	Common Ground	GLA/London Councils/Response
Chapter 5 Fire and Rescue	6	Do you agree that the expenditure data used to determine the coefficients should be updated (FIR1)?	£2.6m	-	Note: Whilst this would benefit MPA/MPS -we have decided not to support as these options as they represent a significant loss for our GLA partners	See note on left	Not Supported - significant loss for Fire-£11.9m
	7	Should annual cashable efficiency savings be added to the updated expenditure data used to determine the coefficients (FIR2)?	£2.4m	-			Not Supported - significant loss for Fire-£11.7m
	8	Would you prefer either FIR3 or FIR4 as an alternative to the current risk index?	FIR3 -£0.2m FIR4 £1.0m	-£0.2m			Not Supported - significant loss for Fire -£20.8m and -£14.1m respectively
Chapter 6 Highways maintenance	9	Do you agree that the daytime visitors component of daytime population per km should be removed? (HM1)	£0.3m	-	Supported	Yes	Supported
	10	Do you agree that the expenditure data used to determine the coefficients should be updated? (HM2)	£0.5m	-	Supported	Yes	Supported
Chapter 7. Environmental, Protective and Cultural Services	11	Do you agree that foreign visitor nights is a suitable replacement for day visitors in the district-level and county-level EPCS RNFs (EPCS1)?	£2.1m	-	Supported	Yes	Supported
	12	Do you agree that the new GIS-based flood defence formula should be used (EPCS2)?	£0.5m	-	Supported	Yes	Supported
	13	Do you agree that the new GIS-based coast protection formula should be used (EPCS3)?	£0.1m	-	Supported	Yes	Supported
Chapter 8 Area Cost Adjustment	14	Do you agree with the proposal to update the weights given to the labour cost adjustment (ACA 1)?	-£4.7m	-£4.7m	Not Supported	Yes	Not Supported

Chapter	Questions		Police Change Before damping	Worst Case Scenario	MPA/MPS response	Common Ground	GLA/London Councils/Response
Chapter 10. Scaling factor for central block allocation	15	Do you think that the scaling factor for the central allocation should be close to one, so that equal importance is attached to the amounts above and below the minima?	No data provided	-	Supported	Yes	Supported
	16	If so, would you prefer Ministers to be able to set judgemental weights for the Relative Needs Amount, as in option CAS1, or the Relative Resource Amount, as in option CAS2?	CAS1 £3.1m CAS2 £9.9m	-	Support Resource CAS2	No	Support Resource CAS1
Chapter 11 Floor damping levels	17	Over the next Spending Review period do you think that the floor level should be set close to the average change or such that it allows some formula change to come through for authorities above the floor?	N/A	-	Supported	Yes	Supported

Chapter	Questions	Police Change Before damping	Worst Case Scenario	MPA/MPS response	Common Ground	GLA/London Councils/Response	
Chapter 12 Transfers and Adjustments	18	Which of the four options for removing concessionary travel from lower-tier authorities do you prefer? CONCF1 CONCF2 CONCF3 CONCF4	-£7.4m -£7.4m -£3.7m -£3.7m	-£7.4m	Whilst there is a nil effect after damping- we can not be certain that damping will remain or will be phased out.	No	Under discussion Whilst Police and Fire lose out - all London Councils gain. May go for options CONCF4
	19	Which of the 12 options for rolling in concessionary travel to upper-tier authorities do you prefer? CONCF5 CONCF6 CONCF7 CONCF8 CONCF9 CONCF10 CONCF11 CONCF12 CONCF13 CONC14 CONCF15 CONCF16	-£11.5m -£11.5m -£0.6m -£0.6m -£12.4m -£12.4m -£11.5m -£11.5m -£0.6m -£0.6m -£12.4m -£12.4m	-£12.4m Potentially this could be higher as still awaiting further information	Whilst there is a nil effect after damping- we can not be certain that damping will remain or will be phased out.	No	Under discussion Whilst Police and Fire lose out - London Councils gain significantly May go options CONCF9/10.
		Which of the remaining 12 supplementary options for rolling in concessionary travel to upper-tier authorities do you prefer? NEW 15/09/2010 - Further independent variable for measuring bus service density CONCF29 CONCF30 CONCF31 CONCF32 CONC33 CONCF34 CONCF35 CONCF36	Awaiting further exemplifications -£2.1m -£2.1m -£15.2m -£15.2m -£2.1m -£2.1m -£15.2m -£15.2m	-£15.2m			

Chapter	Questions	Police Change Before damping	Worst Case Scenario	MPA/MPS response	Common Ground	GLA/London Councils/Response	
	20	Should concessionary travel have its own sub-block?	N/A		No wish to respond without seeing exemplifications	Yes	No wish to respond without seeing exemplifications
	21	Do you agree with the methodology for adjusting the base position for unadopted drains?	N/A	-	No wish to respond without seeing exemplifications	Yes	No wish to respond without seeing exemplifications
Chapter 13 Data1	22	Do you agree that the incapacity benefit and severe disablement allowance indicators should use quarterly data rather than annual data (DATA1)?	£0.0m	-	Supported	Yes	Supported
Chapter 14 Data2 children in out-of-work families	23	Do you agree that children in out-of-work families receiving Child Tax Credit (CTC) should replace the current children of IS/(IB)JSA claimants (DATA2)?	£8.3m	-	Supported	Yes	Supported
Chapter 15 Data3	24	Would you prefer that May data only is used for the student exemptions adjustment in the taxbase projections (DATA3)?	£0.6m	-	Supported	Yes	Supported
Chapter 16 Data4	25	Do you agree that the new definition of secondary school pupils in low achieving ethnic groups should be used (DATA4)?	£0.1m	-	Awaiting London Councils response to this question		Awaiting London Councils response to this question
Suppl. Question City of London		City of London should be split and treated as two notional authorities for floor damping purposes	-		-£4m loss after damping		
		Total if damping floor was removed (Worst case¹)		-£49.7m			

¹ The worse case represents the maximum the MPA/MPS could lose if the damping floor is removed and based on the options provided by the CLG to date. In the final instance it is likely that the MPA will gain from some options and lose from others and the overall pre-damping loss could be lower. This figure excludes the City of London impact which is related to the damping floor itself.