

Title CSS01 Budget Savings Proposal – Customer Engagement Team (v2)

Intended Outcome

To deliver a saving of **£210k** (Out of a total target of £224K which is 15% of Customer Engagement Team's controllable budget), through a change in the delivery model for face to face services delivered through the council's nine customer service points (CSPs), that provides a Best Value approach which reflects the reduced demand for this service. The remaining £14k will be delivered via additional registration income and sundries.

Description

1. We will move to an appointment only model for CSPs and close the doors to walk-in customers whose numbers have fallen to circa 900 a month across all CSPs. This will:
 - Ensure we do not have to close Service Points – they will still provide a face-to-face service but in a more structured way that allows more efficient resource allocation and thus a reduction in CSP agent resources.
 - Ensure we still provide a face-to-face service for vulnerable or digitally challenged customers by offering easy to make appointments, in addition to maintaining our Contact Centre telephone channel. We will also maintain community led but council funded service points on Colonsay and Jura and support the Community Hub in Kilcreggan.
 - Retain our statutory Registration Service intact and keep capacity for essential processing tasks currently completed in CSPs like processing of Blue Badges.
 - Protect the digital delivery element of the Customer Engagement Team which is responsible for supporting over 77% of all customer transactions.
2. We will concentrate all telephone call traffic handling into the Customer Service Centre, which has our call handling experts and has capacity to take the 15% of calls that have hitherto been answered in CSPs. This will in turn free up capacity in CSPs for essential processing tasks currently completed there, like processing of Blue Badges and Travel Card enquiries.

What would an Appointment Only face to face service look like?

CSPs have been operating an appointment service for afternoon customers since post-Covid arrangements were introduced in 2022. There is also an appointment service for Registration Customers to book private meetings regarding births, deaths and ceremonies. We would extend that appointment booking service to cover the whole day. Customers will be able to make appointments over the telephone and online, where appointment slot availability will be shown.

The universal appointment booking window will be between 10 am and 4 pm and the availability of appointments will depend on demand for them and on resources available in each CSP to support them (given core staffing, annual leave and other workload commitments e.g. officiating at on premise weddings). The intention will always be for CSPs to offer the most appointment slots possible, hence this savings proposal includes moving all telephone calls currently handled by CSPs into the contact centre; to free up capacity. Utilisation will be carefully monitored and a customer satisfaction survey will help inform a review of arrangements once they have bedded in.

There will be a comprehensive Communication Plan to ensure customers and voluntary sector stakeholders are aware of the new arrangements. There will also be a transition period where we would still take urgent walk-in customers in case they were not aware of the new arrangements, but they would be informed of the new arrangements and then expected to make an appointment

thereafter. This approach worked well when the Service Points moved to no longer taking cash payments – customers were not refused the first time. Time slots will not be rigidly enforced as CSP agents are aware that the rural nature of our council area and the vagaries of public transport mean that empathetic application of rules will be required.

How will savings be achieved?

This structured appointment-only delivery model will allow more efficient deployment of resources because counters will not need to be rigidly staffed every day, irrespective of demand. Demand will be better matched to available resource and will allow the following reduction in agent resources in five mainland and four island CSPs:

Service Point	Current FTE	Proposed Reduction FTE	Potential Reduction Headcount	Remaining FTE	Potential Saving
Campbeltown	2.7	0.7 LGE6	1	2	£ 24,912
Dunoon	2.8	0.5 LGE6	1	2.3	£ 16,950
Helensburgh	4.5	0.8 LGE6	1	3.7	£ 29,395
Islay	2	0.4 LGE7 0.2 LGE9	1 0	1.4	£ 14,619 £ 9,423
Lochgilphead	3	1.0 LGE6	1	2	£ 35,514
Mull	1.7	0.7 LGE6	1	1	£ 25,146
Oban	3.5	0.2 LGE6	0	3.3	£ 7,102
Rothesay	1.5	0.5 LGE6	1	1	£ 17,369
Tiree	0.4	0.4 LGE7	1	0	£ 15,212
CSC	0.4	0.4 LGE6	0	0	£ 14,204
Total	22.1	4.8 LGE6/0.8 LGE7/0.2 LGE9 (5.8 FTE total)	8	16.7	£209,846

How does your proposal align with strategy?

This approach is part of the **Doing Things Differently** budget theme.

It aligns with the **Connect for Success** principles of maximising use of technology and being data and evidence drive.

It also supports the **Corporate Plan** priority of Sustainable Service Delivery – providing the best services we can for the money and resources available.

It is in line with **Best Value** duties on all councils to use their scarce resources efficiently.

By retaining all of our service points and registration offices we maintain our **Customer Service Strategy** Charter pledge to give customers a wide and inclusive range of ways to contact and engage with us for their convenience and preference, including person to person (through face to face and telephone contact centre) and with 24/7 online and voice automated digital assistance.

Lead and Appropriate Officers

Lead Officer	Job Title	Service
Robert Miller	Customer Engagement Manager	CSS

Appropriate Officer	Job Title	Department
Jane Fowler	Head of Service Customer Support Service	CSS

Who will deliver the proposal

Robert Miller Customer Engagement Manager

Signed Off By

Date 30.01.2026



Evidence

Data – what data have you used to inform the IIA?

Face to Face Service Delivery is now a very small part of total interactions through the Customer Engagement Team. In FQ1-3 of 2025/26 mediated (those requiring handling by a human agent), transactions as a whole made up only 22.3% of all transactions:

2025/26 ALL TOTALS	Q1	Q2	Q3	25/26 for Year	% for Year
Mediated Transactions (CSC/CSP)	40513	38862	31356	110731	22%
Automated Information (voice and web)	76508	79145	77949	233602	47%
Automated Transactions (voice and web)	52784	56192	43560	152536	31%
Total	169805	174199	152865	496869	

Face to Face accounted for only 14,990 out of 496,869 total transactions, which is 13.5% of mediated transactions (transactions where a team member is involved) and 3% of all interactions, but the running of the mediated services takes up over three quarters of the staff resources and face to face accounts for 63% of that mediated staffing or 32% of total budget. Half of that amount is required to run the statutory Registration Service, but there is an imbalance in resourcing because under the current delivery model we are required to keep the CSPs open in the mornings and staffed for walk in customers, no matter how low the demand.

MEDIATED TRANSACTIONS 2025/26	Q1	Q2	Q3	Total
Telephone	26196	24969	17906	69071
Face to Face	5027	5050	4863	14940
Email	5721	5679	5541	16941
Letter	769	820	591	2180
Smart Assistant	173	109	112	394
Digital Assistant	1608	755	0	2363
ChatBot	644	1170	2160	3974
Text	64	91	64	219
Webmail (Contact Us form)	5	7	6	18
Chat	227	109	0	336
Voiceform	79	103	113	295
Total	40513	38862	31356	110731

	Mediated	Digital
Staffing FTE	34.5 (77%)	10.3 (23%)
Interactions FQ1	111k (22%)	286k (78%)

The footfall at many CSPs is very low and has been reducing over time as customers increasing switch to the convenience of digital. 929 customers a month used CSPs on average across FQ1-3 of this year and a very notable decrease since 2022:

Month	Registration Events	Unique Contacts	CSP Incidents
April	218	992	1758
May	267	924	1586
June	242	939	1683
July	255	1001	1828
August	227	923	1628
September	270	897	1594
October	257	1013	1847
November	184	930	1695
December	180	739	1321
Total	2100	8358	14940
	Average 233 per month	Average 929 per month	Average 1660 per month
	301 pm in 2022	1697 pm in 2021/22	6215 pm in 2021/22

There are naturally variations in footfall (unique contacts), but even the busiest did not exceed 200 per month across FQ1-2 of 2025/6 and the Islands are only averaging 2-5 customers a day:

Service Point Totals from 1/10/24 to 30/9/25									
Key measures by CSP	Campbeltown	Dunoon	Helensburgh	Islay	Lochgilhead	Mull	Oban	Rothesay	Tiree
Average Face to Face Incidents per month	307	262	327	52	205	105	235	168	10
Total Unique Contacts in 12 month period	1790	1673	2386	438	1119	569	1899	1317	76
Average Unique Contacts per month	149	139	198	36	93	47	158	109	6
Total Reg Events in 12 month Period	236	469	762	93	337	97	526	162	22
Average Reg Events per month	19	39	63	7	28	8	43	13	1.8
Average Reg Events per month for 2022/23	22	47	101	9	36	10	43	16	2
Total Counter Payments in 12 month Period	815	1059	1953	238	705	247	1168	577	48
Average Counter Payments per month	67	88	162	19	58	20	97	48	4
Average Counter Payments per month for 2022/23	54	77	516	20	27	28	68	29	8

The table below shows the type of enquiry logged at CSPs in the first two quarters of 2025/6. A third are registration related and the bulk of these are already arranged by appointment e.g. to register a death. The remainder are largely walk in enquiries for social care, to make card payment or regarding benefits:

CSP Enquiries by type FQ1/2 2025					
SERVICE	FQ1	FQ1(%)	FQ2	FQ2(%)	TOTAL
Benefits	477	9%	525	10%	1002
Book It	97	2%	110	2%	207
Corporate Complaints	1	0%	0	0%	1
Council Enquiry	817	15%	591	11%	1408
Council Tax	397	7%	352	7%	749
Education	4	0%	18	0%	22
Governance and Law	113	2%	139	3%	252
NEC	59	1%	84	2%	143
Payments	536	10%	619	12%	1155
Planning and Building Standards	34	1%	26	0%	60
Registration	1748	32%	1666	31%	3414
Regulatory Services	44	1%	46	1%	90
Roads and Amenity Services	271	5%	238	4%	509
Social Work	889	16%	891	17%	1780
	5487		5305		10792

Part of the proposal is to move customer calls currently handled in CSPs to the CSC – the CSPs answer about 10- 15% of customer calls (e.g. 551 out of 4876 in November 2025). The extract below shows that in November there was 20% spare capacity in the CSC with agents at ‘Ready’ status awaiting a call or email for 268 hours out of 1324 hours. Hence they have capacity to take the CSP calls without significantly affecting quality of service:

Telephony/Oracle	Total Hours	Percentage
Logged on Hours for November	1324.00	100
Time Spent on Busy Status (hh:mm:ss)	333.00	25%
Ready Status (hh:mm:ss)	268.00	20%
Interacting (hh:mm:ss)	672.00	55%

Other information – This may include reference to reports by other people/organisations relevant to the impacts you identify.

The change of service delivery model in the CSPs is not to close them in entirety as they are required to provide the District Offices for the statutory Registration Service, an alternative contact channel for customers who struggle with Digital.

They are also processing hubs for certain activities. Those activities include processing Blue Badge and Under 22 Travel Card applications:

Blue Badge Applications	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Total
Total 2025-26	80	82	79	157	99	129	137						
Total 2024-25	172	148	125	139	108	135	110	110	87	111	169	100	1514

In 2024/25 there were 2889 Under 22yo Entitlement Card enquiries handled and 252 card applications processed.

In 2025 a pilot was run for a Community Hub, locally run but council supported mini service point in Cove and Kilcreggan. This has proved a worthwhile service as a way of providing council resources such as hard copies of commonly used forms and printed bin calendars etc. It is a model that could be replicated in other communities where there is a partner business or voluntary organisation e.g. foodbank. It should also be noted that the existing community led Service Points on Jura and Colonsay are not affected by these Savings proposals.

Consultation – What consultation/engagement have you carried out to inform the IIA?

- Customer Service Point Supervisors*
- Customer Service Point Agents*
- Customer Service Centre Agents and managers*
- Trade Union Representatives*
- Tiree Community Council*
- Tiree Community Business*
- Oban Community Council*
- Helensburgh Community Council*
- Bute Community Council
- Dunoon Community Council
- Mull Community Council
- Campbeltown Community Council
- Islay Community Council
- Lochgilphead Community Council

Those marked with an asterisk provided responses to date and a digest of matters raised is noted below:

Issues Raised
Lone Working as there would only be one Permanent CSP Member. Cemetery Lair Management if Andrew is away (Could go to Oban) Recycling Punch Cards sales if CSP shut: Could move to Online or Tip. Emergency Wedding Ceremony cover (HBR in Kilfinichen or Oban) Access to Foodbank upstairs will need alternative access arrangements.
Noted that Helensburgh Reception would still need to be covered in the mornings even if the CSP was shut. Noted Helensburgh was the busiest CSP with circa 200 F2F customers a month and 63 registration Events a month.
Noted that Office was vital to fulfilment of statutory Blue Badge application process with Gemma being BB lead and both agents processors. Noted that customers would need to make appointments to pick up Minibus keys as part of a revised process to be agreed with Transport.
Noted that Oban still has regular footfall of vulnerable customers (160p/month of whom 100 make counter payments) with 43 registration events a month. Noted that Oban is growing and has plans for another large new housing estate, also that if Mull and Lochgilphead are reducing staff then Oban will be needed to provide backup and to CSC if network out in C'Town. Oban holds 3 sets of minibus keys so need to make pick up arrangements.
Noted that Dunoon still has reasonable footfall (140 per month with 39 registration events a month) and this may increase with imminent relocation to Argyll House, which is more centrally located. Noted that CSP was to become reception at Argyll Hse, so alternative intercom arrangements will be needed. Noted that cut on Rothesay would leave a lone worker situation that would require alternative measures.
Noted that counter also currently acts as reception for Manse Brae, so if it closes then alternative arrangements need to be put in place e.g. intercom. Noted that CSP staff do room bookings for building staff, so they would need to DIY online. Noted Manse Brae also hold minibus keys.
Noted that Campbeltown was actually a very busy office given size of local population with 150 face to face customers a month. Though only 19 registration events. Noted that Campbeltown is processing hub for u22 NEC Card enquiries, Blue Badge Applications and FSM/CG. Noted Campbeltown also has Senior registrar and sole Registration Trainer so really needs resource for core customer work.
Concerns noted re elderly and vulnerable customers that do not have a clue about online services etc
Concern re lack of other job opportunities on Mull e.g. for redeployment of staff made redundant.
It will be important that volunteer groups who advocate for vulnerable and digitally disadvantaged citizens are fully included in any implementation communication strategy.
Impact on the Checking of Minibus registration of drivers and Organisations and Taxi Driver and Taxi Badge renewals, all of which create income for the Council.
Glad that a full day service will still be provided but concerned about front line staff losses nad stressed the need for strong publicity about the change well in advance.
Could a reduced walk in service e.g. two or three mornings a week be considered instead of full cessation to help protect those who struggle to access services. Where possible reception staff should help vulnerable customers make appointments and the changes must be reviewed and adapted if significant negative impacts are found.

Gaps in Evidence – Are there any gaps in evidence?

The IIA consultation deadline has passed but if any late submissions are made that raise additional concerns these will be added.

Knock on Effects

Knock-n effect – will your proposal have knock-on effects?

Yes

Knock on Effects Details

There will be a requirement to review building access arrangements at some Service Points e.g. for the foodbank at Mull CSP and Manse Brae.

There will need to be a review of the Minibus key pick up arrangements at the CSPs that currently hold these.

There are some CSP specific activities that will require alternative arrangements to be put in place e.g. Lochgilphead CSP staff make room bookings for other staff in that building.

Monitoring

How will you monitor the impacts of your proposal as it progresses?

Quantitative impacts such as changes in customer demand for CSP services and increased use of digital will be monitored through the sophisticated customer relationship management tools in place in the Customer Engagement Team.

Qualitative and equality impacts will be measured through the regular satisfaction surveys (for which there is already a good baseline of historic evidence) as every appointment attendee will be offered a survey including questions on fairness and access etc. and these will be reported quarterly. We will also have feedback from CSP officers, elected representatives at Community Council and elected member level. Feedback can also be sought from the community organisations who we currently partner to deliver services.

Employee impacts will be evaluated through statistical returns, absence returns and employee meetings such as the minuted Area Team Meetings. Financial impacts will be monitored from monthly budget reports and Highlight Reports to Customer Support Services Mgt Team Meetings and input to Policy Leads.

Fairer Scotland Duty

Impact on service users

Mainland Rural Population	Island Population	Low Income	Low Wealth	Material Deprivation
Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative
Area Deprivation	Socio-Economic Background	Communities of Place	Communities of Interest	
Negative	Negative	Negative	No impact	

Impacts on service users details

This change in service delivery model is not removing CSPs or the Registration Service from any community, however it is changing how the people in those communities access their face to face service and that may impact on those service users who struggle to use digital alternatives or who will find the making of an

appointment problematic. That cohort will typically be customers who have disabilities or low income that restricts connectivity or access to devices and thus have equality barriers to access; particularly at very difficult times in their lives.

An appointment only service imposes a degree of inconvenience on customers used to turning up when it is most suitable for them. This is particularly so when the interaction is a brief one such as having to make an appointment just to hand over documents. It may also require customers to take time off work when they could previously have interacted during a lunch break. It is also difficult to use for those leading chaotic lives through drug & alcohol or mental health issues.

The change affects both mainland and Island communities and as such there is equity of application of the change, however Section 7 and 8 duties require the council under the Islands (Scotland) Act 2018 to assess impacts “likely to have an effect on an island community which is significantly different from its effect on other communities”. The perceived reduction of face to face representation will potentially affect these communities disproportionately because they are more vulnerable to digital service disruptions and due to the fact their more aged populations are less likely to undertake or have support to undertake digital transactions. The closing of the doors at CSPs could also be regarded as a further diminution of vital island services for locals and visitors and thus contribute to a reduced sense of community of place and community wellbeing.

A reduction in CSP staffing will also impact the council’s resilience when dealing with any major emergency, for example in the Covid Pandemic the CSP staff did thousands of calls out to shielding customers and helped arrange food parcels at a local level.

Don't knows identified

None

Impact on service deliverers

Mainland Population Negative	Rural Population Negative	Island Population Negative	Low Income Negative	Low Wealth Negative	Material Deprivation No impact
Area Deprivation Negative	Socio-Economic Background No impact	Communities of Place Negative	Communities of Interest No impact		

Impacts on service deliverers details

The reduction in staffing reduces resilience and capability to deal with significant peaks of customer demand due to seasonal, cyclical and one-off operational demands and emergencies. This has potential for temporary reductions in service quality as demand exceeds capacity or appointments cannot be honoured. That in

turn may impact employee wellbeing. There is a consequent probability of increased customer dissatisfaction, resulting in more complaints and thus reputational damage and rework. The Service is currently accredited with the Customer Service Excellence standard.

The income from these posts goes to the individuals and then communities concerned. The loss of tens of thousands of pounds of wage income through lost salaries will have a ripple effect on affected officer, Island and remote rural prosperity.

The council operates a redeployment policy and remote working means geographical barriers are reduced for employment opportunities, but there are fewer council jobs on islands and the loss of income to any officers who cannot be redeployed and will be made redundant will have a significant negative impact.

There is a gender equality issue with the proposal in that 9 out of the 11 employees whose posts are at risk of redundancy are female, although this is proportionate to the overall gender make up of the face-to-face service.

Mull and Rothesay CSPs will become lone worker CSPs thus will require full risk assessment and mitigations put in place.

Due regard

There was due regard to minimising negative impacts and minimising inequality and impacts on users.

Although the provision of a walk in service is of undoubted benefit to vulnerable customers, it is a very expensive service to provide; particularly on a cost per transaction basis. An approximate cost per face-to-face customer visit in 2025/6 is £24.34. (£1.92 for digital and £3.96 for other mediated. Hence when it comes to making budget savings far fewer people are affected per pound by reducing the face to face service than digital or contact centre resources.

The proposed change in model does NOT mean closing the service points, but moving to an appointment based model. An on demand face to face service is arguably a luxury the council can no longer afford as the counters have to be staffed, irrespective of demand. An appointment based model allows a core face to face service to be provided, but in a more structured and sustainably efficient way as it allows supervisors to flexibly match demand to resources. By having the same model on islands and mainland there is equality of service provision irrespective of geography.

The Registration service has been safeguarded, not only because this is a statutory service, but because it is the most popular service required by and used by CSP customers, with nearly a third of all visits to CSPs for Registration.

The level of resource cuts at each CSP (and thus impact on individual staff at risk of redundancy) has had due regard to their workloads, footfall, registration activity,

processing activity and trends over time. This has led to an equitable balance of reductions whilst leaving CSPs with enough resources to provide an appointment service; particularly as they will no longer have to answer telephone calls for the CSC.

No Impact Justification (To be completed if the screening has shown you do not have to complete this impact assessment)

There is no definable impact on Communities of Interest for Service Users (unless that Community is CSP customers) and Communities of Interest, Socio-economic Background and Material Deprivation for service providers.

Consumer Duty

Does your proposal affect individuals, businesses or both?

Both, but individuals are by far the greater users of CSP services.

On the basis of your assessment, what are the likely impacts of your proposal?

Choice Negative	Fairness Negative	Redress Negative	Safety No impact
Information Negative	Access Negative	Representation No impact	

Describe the positive impacts you have identified

This by appointment model of delivery is a more financially sustainable one as the cost of retaining an on-demand service where footfall is below 1000 customers a month and only 2.5% of all interactions – yet takes 32% of the team budget. Moving to an appointment model allows a face to face-to-face service to remain for those who cannot do digital and fulfils the “No-one left behind” promise.

Describe the negative impacts you have identified

Removing an on demand walk up service will constrict access to service by making customers book an appointment at a time that aids efficient service delivery but which may be less convenient to customers.

The change in model will restrict choice, just as the move to morning only walk in service did in 2022, but that too was a sensible and accepted reflection of the cost to deliver outweighing customer convenience.

As noted above although the change applies fairly across all CSPs, it may impact Island consumers more than mainland ones due to connectivity and age profile demographics.

There may be informational impacts in that although customers largely visit CSPs to make specific transactions, they can elicit information in the form of brochures, posters and word of mouth. If fewer customers choose to use CSPs because they have to make an appointment then the opportunity to gain information will reduce.

Consumers of the CSP service do use them to seek redress, although this is very low in number – only seven reports in FQ1+2 of 2025/6. Customers could still make an appointment to do this.

What alternatives have you considered which can improve outcomes for customers and/or reduce harm?

This appointment model is the alternative to full closure of the CSPs which would have much more negative impact. As would retaining the status quo for Face to Face to making cuts to digital or Contact Centre, where many more customers would be affected.

A variable model of keeping the four most well used CSPs open as present to walk-ins but closing the less used ones was considered but this would result in claims of different areas being treated more favourably and would still require alternative cuts to digital and CSC to make saving targets.

How have you reduced harm to consumers through the development of your proposal?

The development of an appointment-based model with no CSP closures and protection for the Statutory Registration Service is the best balance between providing an efficient service but one which still provides a face-to-face alternative for digital strugglers. In this way harms are reduced. It should also be remembered that the telephone-based contact centre service is not affected.

If you have not been able to reduce harm to your consumers, why not?

N/A

No Impact Justification (To be completed if the screening has shown you do not have to complete this impact assessment)

There is no impact on safety or representation aspects of consumer duty as consumers still have the opportunity to raise safety concerns or give input to council services through the telephone and by appointment at CSPs for non-digital users and the full range of digital services are open to other consumers.

Children's Rights and Wellbeing

Direct and indirect impacts on children and young people

Are there any aspects to your proposal which directly impact on children?

No. Children do not use CSPs. The under 22 Travel Card Service will still be fully supported.

Are there any aspects to your proposal which indirectly impact on children?

No. Parents of children can use alternative channels or make a face to face appointment or raise concerns through schools.

Describe which groups of children and young people are affected by your proposal.

N/A

How are these groups you have identified affected by your proposal.

N/A

Children's rights

Article 2: (non-discrimination) No impact	Article 3: (best interest of the child) No impact
Article 6: (life, survival and development) No impact	Article 12: (respect for the views of the child) No impact

Have you identified any other articles as being relevant to your proposal?

No

What articles are relevant to your proposal? (This, along with the following five questions, appears if you answer 'yes' to having identified other articles as being relevant.)

N/A

If you have identified any positive impacts, describe what these are?

N/A

If you have identified any negative impacts, describe what these are?

N/A

What options have you considered to reduce negative impacts?

n/A

If you cannot implement measures to mitigate impact why not?

N/A

If you have identified relevant articles for which you don't know what the likely impact will be, how will you monitor impact as your proposal progresses?

N/A

Children's wellbeing

For each wellbeing indicator, review whether your proposal will result in an improvement to children’s wellbeing or not. (More information about the indicators is given in the guidance.)

Safe	Healthy	Achieving	Nurtured
No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact
Active	Respected	Responsible	Included
No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact

For the indicators where you believe your proposal will result in reduced children's wellbeing, explain what these reductions will be.

N/A

For the indicators where you believe your proposal will result in improved children's wellbeing, explain what these improvements will be.

N/A

If you have identified any indicators as being relevant to your proposal, but you do not know what the impacts will be, explain how you will monitor impact as your proposal progresses.

N/A

No Impact Justification (To be completed if the screening has shown you do not have to complete this impact assessment)

Children do not use CSPs. The under 22 Travel Card Service will still be fully supported.

Island Communities

How many islands does your proposal affect?

Some

Which islands are affected by your proposal?

Mull, Tiree, Bute, Islay

Does your proposal impact on island communities...?

Demography Negative	Economy Negative	Society Negative
-------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Describe any positive impacts you have identified.

The move to an appointment based CSP model will allow CSPs to be provided on a more financially sustainable footing that will help to retain them as offices on islands for face to face customer service and as Registration Offices and community hubs for meetings etc.

Describe any negative impacts you have identified.

There will be a net loss of 2.2FTE staff across the four islands:

Service Point	Current FTE	Proposed Reduction FTE	Potential Reduction Headcount	Remaining FTE	Potential Saving	Average footfall p/Month	Registration Events 2024	Other Activities at CSP
Islay	2	0.4 LGE7 0.2 LGE9	1	1.4	£ 14,125 £ 9,105	38	110	Blue Badges Blue Badges
Mull	1.7	0.7 LGE6	1	1	£ 24,296	49	107	Stats, TUO
Rothesay	1.5	0.5 LGE6	1	1	£ 16,782	105	182	FSM/CG
Tiree	0.4	0.4 LGE7	1	0	£ 14,698	7	23	

This will reduce income to the islands by a total of £79,000 from salaries.

An appointment based model will require customers to contact the council to make a face to face appointment, which is a restriction on choice and access. The change affects both mainland and Island communities and as such there is equity of application of the change. However islands have poorer connectivity and older populations with more disabilities, so this change may affect these communities disproportionately because islanders will find it more difficult to make an appointments and poor public transport makes it harder to keep them.

Islands are more vulnerable to disruptions and CSPs are centres for emergency support and less staff means less resilience. The closing of the doors at CSPs could also be regarded as a further diminution of vital island services for locals and visitors and thus contribute to a reduced sense of community of place and community wellbeing.

If you do not know what the impacts will be, you should reflect this in your monitoring arrangements for the proposal.

Noted

Describe how your proposal affects the islands communities you have identified differently from other communities including other islands communities and mainland areas.

As noted above the proposals are the same for mainland and island but it is the connectivity, demographic and resilience elements that may impact islands differentially. The loss of income will also be more greatly felt to smaller island economies and less job opportunities for people in these remote communities. There are also likely to be more disruptions to an appointment service on island CSPs as they do not have numbers to provide back up if there is sickness.

How will you ensure your proposal delivers equivalent levels of service to the islands communities you have identified compared to other areas, including mainland areas? (In your answer you should include descriptions of:

The appointment based delivery model is the same on the islands and mainland and both ensure a viable statutory Registration service for births deaths and marriages and remote working allows this work to be done anywhere in Argyll and Bute.

Hyper local arrangements will be covered through provision of alternative or partner arrangements for example physical Tip Tickets for commercial waste dumping on Tiree has been moved to a digital process and cover agreed for Lair management.

Cover arrangements will be put in place from other CSPs for Mull and Bute where single officer CSPs will be left after staff reductions. This will cover Annual Leave and sickness, although there will be a greater risk of unforeseen CSP closures.

If you have not been able to mitigate impacts, why not?

N/A

No Impact Justification (To be completed if the screening has shown you do not have to complete this impact assessment)

N/A

Equality impact

Equality impact on service users

Disability Negative	Race No impact	Marriage and civil partnership No impact	Religion or belief No impact	Sex No impact
Pregnancy and maternity No impact	Age Negative	Sexual orientation No impact	Gender reassignment No impact	

Impact identified

The main impacts will be on the elderly and disabled who are less likely to be able to navigate an appointment-based face to face service as these cohorts tend to be digital strugglers.

There is also anecdotal evidence from CSP officers that certain customers from these cohorts use CSPs to reduce their isolation in that visiting the CSPs gives them a reason to go out and interact with CSP staff and others. Having appointments may disincentivise them from doing this.

Don't knows identified

N/A

Equality impact on service deliverers

Disability No impact	Race No impact	Marriage and civil partnership No impact	Religion or belief No impact	Sex Negative
Pregnancy and maternity No impact	Age Negative	Sexual orientation No impact	Gender reassignment No impact	

Impact on service deliverers

Nine out of eleven at risk of redundancy employees are female so there is an equality imbalance, although this proportion does reflect the overall gender balance of the service.

Older at risk of redundancy employees may find it difficult to find alternative employment as studies have indicated that this is generally the case.

Don't knows identified

N/A

Due regard

In order to ensure ongoing access to council services for those cohorts with protected characteristics that struggle with digital services this proposal has ensured the Customer Service Centre telephone service is unaffected and the face-to-face service is moved to a more sustainable appointment based service. The Registration service will also be protected.

Care will be taken to ensure the booking of appointments is made as simple as possible and will be available by telephone, email and online so that the potential barrier to access for the elderly and disabled is minimised.

No Impact Justification (To be completed if the screening has shown you do not have to complete this impact assessment)

There is no material impact from the proposals on the following protected characteristic cohorts: Race, Religion or belief, Sex, Pregnancy and maternity, Sexual orientation, Gender re-assignment. Marriage and Civil Partnership will be unaffected as the Registration Service and local registration offices that are also CSPs, will be protected by these proposals.