

Report to the Assembly on the Mayor's Draft Consolidated Budget for 2012 – 2013

Report to: London Assembly

Date: 25th January 2012

Report of: Conservative Group

Proposed by: Gareth Bacon

Seconded by: James Cleverly

PART A: INTRODUCTION & COMMENTARY¹

¹ This report is made up of two Parts, A and B. The text in Part A does not form part of the formal budget amendments, which are set out in Part B.

(This page has been deliberately left blank)

Conservative Alternative Greater London Authority Budget

2012 – 2013

By the London Assembly Conservative Group:

**James Cleverly
Richard Tracey
Tony Arbour
Gareth Bacon
Richard Barnes
Andrew Boff
Victoria Borwick
Brian Coleman
Roger Evans
Kit Malthouse
Steve O'Connell**

January 2012

Introduction

The Conservative Assembly Group is producing its third alternative budget under a Conservative Mayor and administration in City Hall. Whereas under the previous administration we proposed wide-ranging alterations across all of the GLA Group to hold the Council Tax precept down to a more reasonable and realistic level in the face of a belligerent Mayor keen to squeeze every penny out of Londoners, we now have in Boris Johnson a far more responsible Mayor who is pressing down on costs across all the functional bodies and favouring a more realistic budget than his predecessor.

We welcome the freeze in the precept for an unprecedented fourth year running. Ken Livingstone never got close to achieving a precept freeze or of even trying to do so even despite his Mayoralty coinciding with a time of financial prosperity. In contrast, Boris Johnson has once again frozen the GLA’s share of the Council Tax bill, an act that has provided a real terms cut over the four years of 12%. This is money staying in the pockets of hard working Londoners at a time of financial pressure in the UK. It will be interesting to see if the opposition parties are able or willing to meet this pledge to freeze the precept in their own alternatives.

It is worth looking back at the record of Mr Livingstone on the precept whilst he was in office. During his eight years he saw fit to increase the precept burden on all Londoners by 152% whilst at the same time indulging in RPI+10% fare increases for TfL in non-election years followed by a cynical fare cut as the ballot box loomed. The record during his administration saw first term annual increases of 23%; 15%; 29% and 7.5% - the fourth year was presumably another election sweetener.

Ken Livingstone’s annual precept: 2000-2008

Year	Livingstone precept - £	Livingstone increase - £	Livingstone increase – %
2000-01	£122.98	-	-
2001-02	£150.88	£28.00	22.9%
2002-03	£173.88	£23.00	15.2%
2003-04	£224.40	£50.52	29.1%
2004-05	£241.33	£16.93	7.5%
2005-06	£254.62	£13.29	5.5%
2006-07	£288.61	£33.99	13.4%
2007-08	£303.88	£15.27	5.3%
2008-09	£309.82	£5.94	2.0%
Total 2000-08	-	£186.84	+152%

In contrast, Boris Johnson has been able to drive his successes whilst holding the precept down – just what Londoners expect him to do. The successes outlined in the Mayor’s budget and the measures that he has had to take are despite the Labour Party’s miserable failure and mismanagement of the public finances that left the country with billions owed in structural deficit and paying £120m per day in interest alone. That is the legacy of Labour and any return of Livingstone as Mayor would only bring more of the same.

One significant area where we would like to see improvement, and which we know the other groups share on their concern with us, is over the shared services agenda. The target for the coming two financial years was a £450m saving across the whole group but progress has been slow so far with only 52% of the target identified. Some of the functional bodies have taken a position that shared services can be generated in house between their own departments rather than across group or with outside bodies such as county police and fire services.

The Conservative group believes that a significant improvement could be achieved in cross-group shared service savings. As an example, we give the various separate press, media and communications units across the London Assembly, MPS, TFL and LFEPA who have a combined press and communications budget of £4.9m in 2012-13 and 79 staff. Once a lead functional body is identified to take this on we believe a saving of 50% from the overall budget is possible. This is something that the GLA should certainly work toward organising.

The MOPC have already led the way since their inception on 16th January with their press and media function being undertaken by the Mayor's Press Office in a shared service. We believe this saving is possible because the MPA press budget in 2011-12 was £161k and now that the press and media function for the MOPC has been merged into the Mayor's Office, their press budgets have only increased by £7k.

All of the remaining different departments deal in essentially the same business regardless of functional body. Therefore we view it as appropriate for the shared services agenda to work towards amalgamating all the units into one that can cover press and communications issues across the whole group and do so for a much smaller cost.

The Assembly, LFEPA and TfL can make this a saving to the precept and therefore the taxpayer, whilst the savings to police can be reinvested into improving neighbourhood policing.

Core GLA - Mayor

	Mayor's draft	Conservative proposal
GLA Core	£m	£m
2011-12 Budget requirement	147.0	147.0
Change:	Change:	Change:
Inflation	0.0	0.0
Savings & efficiencies	-2.9	-2.9
New initiatives & service improvements	54.2	54.2
Change in use of reserves	-7.8	-7.8
Contingency available for the Group budget	2.9	2.9
Community Safety functions transfer to MOPC	-1.8	-1.8
Changes in Government funding & finance	-59.8	-59.8
2012-13 total	131.8	131.8

The previous Mayor took what was supposed to be a lean and strategic authority and turned it into a bloated bureaucracy more reminiscent of the bad old days of the GLC than modern regional government.

Since the change of Mayor in 2008, the theme of the administration has been to reduce the burden on taxpayers whilst maintaining the work provided by the organisation. New successes have included;

- ❑ 3 new rape crisis centres and extra funding for the existing Croydon centre after closures during the Livingstone years
- ❑ Investment into London parks and street trees
- ❑ Economic recovery plan launched
- ❑ Preventing violence against women strategy developed
- ❑ Protection for London's green spaces rather than allowing them to be concreted over by developers using the Labour government's planning guidelines that turned back gardens into brown field sites
- ❑ City Hall establishment reduced to cut the burden on the taxpayer
- ❑ Cutting waste and making savings across the group of £1bn

Changes are now afoot with the devolution agenda. The LDA and London HCA are being merged into the GLA and City Hall is taking on greater roles in regeneration, economic development and public health whilst community safety moves under the remit of the new MOPC. The future for the GLA is one of an expanded remit that the current Mayor has worked hard to ensure runs as efficiently as possible. Of the two London Mayors, only Boris Johnson has proven he can manage an efficient administration and work with Government to ensure the best for London.

Core GLA – Assembly

	Mayor’s draft	Conservative proposal
GLA Core	£m	£m
2011-12 Budget total	8.0	8.0
Change:	Change:	Change:
Inflation	0.0	0.0
Savings & efficiencies	-0.3	-0.3
Member Services savings	0.0	-0.2
Additional savings from media and communications shared service savings	0.0	-0.15
2012-13 total	7.7	7.35

The Conservative Assembly Group is happy to see proposals from the Assembly for a £250,000 saving from the budget. Within the savings target another £70,000 is being taken this year from the Conservative group to help meet the Assembly savings target, which we can do through our sound financial management and keeping costs down. This is on the back of £189,000 that was removed from the Conservative Group budget in 2011-12 – a saving that benefits the GLA year on year by having been removed from the funding base.

However, we think there is still some scope for improvement in political groups’ cost savings. In 2011-12 when we were saving Londoners money the other groups combined only managed a paltry £50,000. We also proposed a further reduction to save another £360,000 from Member Services. If the savings we have proposed during the term had been accepted by the other groups then the cumulative savings over four years would have reached £1m. These are the kind of economics that Londoners want to see, the kind where their tax pound is not spent recklessly.

The Conservative group continues to believe that greater efficiencies can be squeezed from the funding to political parties. Therefore we propose a 10% saving of £200,000 from Member Services for the coming year together with another £150,000 from the shared services amalgamation of the communications function.

Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime

	Mayor's draft	Conservative proposal
MPA	£m	£m
2011-12 Budget requirement	2,713.0	2,713.0
Change:	Change:	Change:
Inflation	2.0	2.0
Net growth in existing services & programmes	9.8	9.8
New initiatives & service improvements	63.1	63.1
Savings & efficiencies	-51.8	-51.8
Additional savings from media and communications shared service savings	0.0	-1.1
Funding for extra neighbourhood policing from savings to communications budget	0.0	1.1
Changes in specific grants	-65.5	-65.5
Transfer from reserves	16.9	16.9
Community Safety functions transfer to MOPC	7.2	7.2
Other adjustments	-8.0	-8.0
Savings to be identified	-85.5	-85.5
2012-13 total	2,601.2	2,601.2

The Police remain the largest call upon the precept with 76% of the investment made by Londoners to the GLA group going to the MOPC. Projects that this investment supports include maintaining the Safer Neighbourhood Teams for local policing reducing youth violence and knife crime, and preparing for the security of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

In previous years we have highlighted the Mayor's actions in promoting Operation Herald to free up 550 warranted officers from back office roles to return to the front line for London's benefit. In a time of austerity it is only right that public authorities maximise their resources and use fully trained and experienced officers in the roles they are trained for.

One of the recurring attempts by the opposition is to try and criticise the Mayor for cutting police officer numbers. What the Mayor has always said is that officer numbers will be higher at the end of his four year term than they were at the beginning. This is exactly what will happen as in April 2008 the Met had 31,400 warranted officers (of which 1,000 were still trainees) and in April 2012 the establishment will be 32,320. Basic maths can establish that these numbers mean an increase in warranted officers over the last four years.

On top of this Special Constables have topped 5,000 this year. Considering they each patrol for a minimum of four hours per week they equate to 10% of a paid officer so the Met has the equivalent of another 500 extra officers for London. In 2008 London had less than 1,000.

Additionally, the move to single patrolling in appropriate areas is worth an extra 330 officers and the Met have become the first police force to restart recruitment during 2011 to replace those officers that resign or retire.

Financially, the Mayor has also shown his commitment to policing in London through the reallocation of £30m of resources from LFEPA to the Met. This is on the back of a similar reallocation from LFEPA last year as well. For many years the Assembly Conservative group advocated the flexible use of finances across the group. The previous Mayor dogmatically resisted such a move but it is pleasing to see the current Mayor not being as precious as his predecessor and using the GLA group resources for the full benefit of Londoners in the areas they are most needed.

These radical improvements to policing the capital have been met with other positives over the last four years, such as the Mayor's expansion of Safer Transport Teams; protection of Safer Neighbourhood Teams; creation of the Time for Action project on youth crime and the expansion and extra funding of rape crisis centres, which the previous Mayor only closed down.

The truth is that Mayor Boris Johnson has proven his commitment to policing in London and is fulfilling his promise to provide more policing and security for Londoners and the opposition should recognise this fact because Londoners certainly do.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

	Mayor's draft	Conservative proposal
LFEPA	£m	£m
2011-12 Budget requirement	409.4	409.4
Change:	Change:	Change:
Inflation	8.4	8.4
Net committed savings in existing services and programmes	-1.1	-1.1
Savings & efficiencies	-21.1	-21.1
Additional savings from media and communications shared service savings	0.0	-0.16
Changes in specific grants	0.0	0.0
Change in use of reserves	-15.8	-15.8
2012-13 total	379.8	379.64

LFEPA remains probably the tightest run budget amongst the functional bodies with a genuine desire to modernise and to seek savings through shared services across both the GLA group and out to other fire brigades. Where LFEPA has particularly succeeded over the course of this term is in the good stewardship from its leadership in building up the reserves and steering the ship successfully to the strong point that it currently is in, which has allowed the Mayor the flexibility to channel additional resources into the MPA where they were needed.

Precept funding was channelled from LFEPA to the MPA in 2011-12 and the Mayor has again been able to vire resources from one functional body to another in 2012-13 through the use of £30m from the LFEPA reserves to improve policing in the capital. The LFEPA leadership is capable of managing this use of resources and reserves away from themselves for the greater good and in ensuring that LFEPA itself suffers no ill effect.

LFEPA provides a good example of joined up partnership working and the rest of local government should take note.

TfL

	Mayor's draft	Conservative proposal
TfL	£m	£m
2011-12 Budget requirement	6.0	6.0
Change:	Change:	Change:
Inflation	90.0	90.0
Fares, charges & other income	-213.0	-213.0
Increases in PPP/ PFI payments	-6.0	-6.0
Net operational increases/ decreases	-58.0	-58.0
Capital projects	-151.0	-151.0
Debt servicing, contingency & other items	-5.0	-5.0
Funding & working capital	343.0	343.0
Removal of Olympic tours funding for 30,000 TfL staff	0.0	-1.0
Additional savings from media and communications shared service savings	0.0	-1.0
2012-13 total	6.0	4.0

As an Assembly Group we are also proposing the removal of the £1m being spent by TfL on transporting TfL staff around the Olympic site to win hearts and minds. This is a poor use of money and unnecessary for the running of transport in London. We would additionally remove another £1m as part of the shared services agenda for press and communications so that a better group wide resource can be developed.

As with last year's debate however, the main issue will no doubt centre on the fares package for 2012, especially with the Labour candidates' ever more desperate attempts to bribe Londoners with his proposed fares cut, a fares cut that will only harm London and damage the investment in the transport system that Boris Johnson has been leading on for the last four years and which continues to be essential for London.

The position needs to be stated very clearly; Boris Johnson was bequeathed a black hole in TfL's finances by the previous administration that cynically used fares as a political football to bribe Londoners. Such a terrible heritage needed to be addressed and Boris Johnson set about doing so by instituting a savings programme over the course of TfL's business plan while also starting in motion the positive infrastructure developments for the London transport system.

A quick look at the Mayor's performance despite the hard economic situation bequeathed by the Labour government with their mishandling of the economy shows what has been achieved.

- ❖ All free and concessionary fares have been protected by the Mayor so that 40% of bus passengers will continue to have free or subsidised travel
- ❖ Removal of Congestion Charge western extension, as per the residents' wishes, and autopay introduced
- ❖ The cycle hire scheme has been introduced
- ❖ Bendy buses removed
- ❖ Cable car is being built
- ❖ Safer Transport Teams expanded
- ❖ Alcohol banned on the transport network
- ❖ Countdown system expanded
- ❖ Additional trams coming to Croydon tramlink
- ❖ Oyster card extended to mainline rail
- ❖ Crossrail being built
- ❖ Jubilee line upgrade
- ❖ London Overground completed

Ken Livingstone and his cohort complain solely about fare increases and have nothing to say on the improvements to the transport network, but what they fail to mention is that in the 3 years after the 2004 election the former Mayor raised fares by RPI+10% each year. Between 2005 and 2007 the Oyster fare increased by 42%.

In his first term, Mr Livingstone tortured the Council Tax payer, in his second term he moved on to the transport fare payer, so to complain about fare increases to invest in a transport system under provisioned for the eight years of his Mayoralty is just a touch hypocritical, especially when the suspicion remains that the former Mayor only reduced fares in January 2008 as an election bribe and not because TfL could afford the loss in income.

The proposals Mr Livingstone puts forward would mean a £1.14bn shortfall in fares income to 2014-15 and will simply lead to massive cuts in infrastructure development on London's transport system and underinvestment for years to come.

The real questions to Ken Livingstone's proposals are how in earnest they are, what valuable investments a third Livingstone Mayoralty would scrap and are they really just grist to appease the union paymasters that house and fund the Livingstone campaign rather than a serious proposal that he simply reneges on in office, as he did with the promise not to increase fares after the 2004 election.

Summary of Proposals – Budget Requirements

	Base 2011-12	Mayor's proposals 2012-13	Alternative proposals 2012-13
MPA	£2,713.0m	£2,601.2m	£ 2,601.2m
LFEPa	£ 409.4m	£ 379.8m	£ 379.64m
TfL	£ 6.0m	£ 6.0m	£ 4.0m
Core GLA - Mayor	£ 138.6m	£ 131.8m	£ 131.8m
Core GLA - Assembly	£ 8.0m	£ 7.7m	£ 7.35m
Total budget	£3,275.0m	£3,126.5m	£3,123.99m
Council Tax income	£ 934.8m	£ 934.8m	£ 932.29m
Precept increase (Band D)	-	-	-£0.83
Total Band D precept	£ 309.82	£ 309.82	£308.99

PART B: Proposal to approve, with amendments, the Draft Consolidated Budget for the 2012-13 financial year for the Greater London Authority and the Functional Bodies.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

FORMAL BUDGET AMENDMENT

1. The Mayor’s draft consolidated budget (together with the component budgets comprised within it) for 2012-13 be amended by the sum(s) shown in column number 3 of the table for each constituent body, as set out and in accordance with the attached Schedule.

(These sums are the calculations under sections 85(4) to (8) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended) (‘The Act’) which give rise to each of the amounts mentioned in recommendations 2 and 3 below.)

2. The calculations referred to in recommendation 1 above, give rise to a component council tax requirement for 2012-13 for each constituent body as follows:

<i>Constituent body</i>	<i>Component council tax requirement</i>
Greater London Authority: Mayor of London	£87,050,000
Greater London Authority: London Assembly	£2,250,000
Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime	£711,394,960
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority	£127,579,727
Transport for London	£4,000,000

3. The component council tax requirements shown in recommendation 2 above, give rise to a consolidated council tax requirement for the Authority for 2012-13 (shown at Line 56 in the attached Schedule) of **£932,274,687**

BUDGET RELATED MOTIONS

4. [WHERE APPLICABLE, INSERT ANY OTHER BUDGET RELATED MOTIONS REQUIRED]

NOTES:

- a. A simple majority of votes cast by Assembly members is required to approve any amendment to recommendations (1) to (3) above concerning the Draft Consolidated Budget; abstentions are not counted.
- b. To approve the Draft Consolidated Budget, without amendment, only a simple majority of votes cast is required. Again, abstentions are not counted.
- c. The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime replaces the Metropolitan Police Authority with effect from 16 January 2012 (Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 and SI 2011/3019)
- d. The statutory budget calculations reflect the amendments made to sections 85 to 89 and Schedule 6 of the GLA Act under the Localism Act 2011 which came into force on 3 December 2011. The Mayor will from 2012-13 onwards be required to set a consolidated and component council tax requirement (rather than a budget requirement) and it is this which the Assembly will have the power to amend. The council tax requirement equates to the amount which will be allocated to the Mayor, the Assembly and for each functional body from the Mayor's council tax precept i.e. the budget requirement calculated under these sections in prior years net of general government grants (GLA General grant for the Mayor and Assembly, formula grant for LFEPA and MOPC - comprising revenue support grant and redistributed non domestic rates - and Home Office police grant for MOPC). These individual functional body requirements are consolidated to form the consolidated council tax requirement for the GLA Group.
- e. The income estimates calculated under section 85 5(a) of the GLA Act are presented in three parts within the statutory calculations:
 - Income not in respect of government grant which includes fare revenues, congestion charging the Crossrail business rate supplement and all other income not received from central government (line 6 for the Mayor, line 17 for the Assembly, line 28 for MOPC, line 39 for LFEPA and line 50 for TfL);
 - Income in respect of specific and special government grants i.e. those grants which were not regarded as general grants. This includes the GLA Transport grant for TfL and specific grants for the GLA, LFEPA and MOPC (line 7 for the Mayor, line 18 for the Assembly, line 29 for MOPC, line 40 for LFEPA and line 51 for TfL);
 - Income in respect of general government grants i.e. GLA general grant, formula grant and Home Office police grant (line 8 for the Mayor, line 19 for the Assembly, line 30 for MOPC, line 41 for LFEPA and line 52 for TfL).

In preparing amendments it should be noted that the latter two items relate to government grant income and are not directly in the control of the Mayor, the GLA or functional bodies.

- f. It is expected that the functions of the Olympic Park Legacy Company will be substantially transferred to a Mayoral Development Corporation during 2012-13. Neither of these bodies – ie neither the OPLC nor the MDC - is currently a constituent body for budget purposes and their budgets are therefore not reflected in the statutory calculations.

SCHEDULE

Part 1: Greater London Authority: Mayor of London (“Mayor”) draft component budget

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If “nil” or “£0” is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
Line	Mayor’s Proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(1)	£367,550,000	£	estimated expenditure of the Mayor for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(2)	£11,800,000	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for the Mayor under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(3)	£0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Mayor under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(4)	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Mayor under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(5)	£379,350,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the Mayor (lines (1) + (2) + (3) + (4) above)
(6)	-£146,000,000	£	estimate of the Mayor’s income not in respect of Government grant or precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(7)	-£93,800,000	£	estimate of the Mayor’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(8)	-£44,700,000	£	estimate of the Mayor’s income in respect of redistributed non domestic rates, revenue support grant, police grant and GLA general grant calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(9)	-£7,800,000	£	estimate of Mayor’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (1) and (2) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(10)	-£292,300,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the Mayor (lines (6) + (7) + (8) + (9))
(11)	£87,050,000	£	the component council tax requirement for the Mayor (being the amount by which the aggregate at (5) above exceeds the aggregate at (10) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The draft component council tax requirement for the Mayor for 2012-13 is £87,050,000

Part 2: Greater London Authority: London Assembly (“Assembly”) draft component budget

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If “nil” or “£0” is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
Line	Mayor’s proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(12)	£7,700,000	£7,350,000	estimated expenditure of the Assembly for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(13)	£0	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for the Assembly under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(14)	£0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Assembly under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(15)	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Assembly under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(16)	£7,700,000	£7,350,000	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the Assembly (lines (12) + (13) + (14) + (15) above)
(17)	£0	£	estimate of the Assembly’s income not in respect of Government grant or precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(18)	£0	£	estimate of the Assembly’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(19)	-£5,100,000	£	estimate of the Assembly’s income in respect of redistributed non domestic rates, revenue support grant, police grant and GLA general grant calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(20)	£0	£	estimate of Assembly’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (12) and (13) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(21)	-£5,100,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the Assembly (lines (17) + (18) + (19) + (20))
(22)	£2,600,000	£2,250,000	the component council tax requirement for the Assembly (being the amount by which the aggregate at (16) above exceeds the aggregate at (21) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The draft component council tax requirement for the Assembly for 2012-13 is: £2,250,000

Part 3: Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (“MOPC”) draft component budget

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If “nil” or “£0” is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
Line	Mayor’s proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(23)	£3,471,800,000	£	estimated expenditure of the MOPC calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(24)	-	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for the MOPC under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(25)	-	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the MOPC under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(26)	-	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the MOPC under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(27)	£3,471,800,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the MOPC (lines (23) + (24) + (25) + (26) above)
(28)	-£292,400,000	£	estimate of the MOPC’s income not in respect of Government grant or precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(29)	-£559,200,000	£	estimate of the MOPC’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(30)	-£1,889,805,040	£	estimate of the MOPC’s income in respect of redistributed non domestic rates, revenue support grant, police grant and GLA general grant calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(31)	-£19,000,000	£	estimate of MOPC’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (23) and (24) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(32)	-£2,760,405,040	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the MOPC (lines (28) + (29) + (30) + (31))
(33)	£711,394,960	£	the component council tax requirement for MOPC (being the amount by which the aggregate at (27) above exceeds the aggregate at (32) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The draft component council tax requirement for MOPC for 2012-13 is: £711,394,960

Part 4: London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (“LFEPA”) draft component budget

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If “nil” or “£0” is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
	Mayor’s Proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(34)	£448,100,000	£447,940,000	estimated expenditure of LFEPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(35)	£0	£	Estimated allowance for contingencies for LFEPA under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(36)	£0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of LFEPA under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(37)	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of LFEPA under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(38)	£448,100,000	£447,940,000	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for LFEPA (lines (34) + (35) + (36) + (37) above)
(39)	-£27,400,000	£	estimate of LFEPA’s income not in respect of Government grant or precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(40)	-£10,900,000	£	estimate of LFEPA’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(41)	-£252,060,273	£	estimate of LFEPA’s income in respect of redistributed non domestic rates, revenue support grant, police grant and GLA general grant calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(42)	-£30,000,000	£	estimate of LFEPA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (34) and (35) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(43)	-£320,360,273	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for LFEPA (lines (39) + (40) + (41) + (42) above)
(44)	£127,739,727	£127,579,727	the component council tax requirement for LFEPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (38) above exceeds the aggregate at (43) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The draft component council tax requirement for LFEPA for 2012-13 is: £127,579,727

Part 5: Transport for London (“TfL”) draft component budget

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If “nil” or “£0” is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
Line	Mayor’s proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(45)	£10,040,000,000	£10,038,000,000	estimated expenditure of TfL for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(46)	£0	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for TfL under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(47)	£248,000,000	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of TfL under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(48)	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of TfL under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(49)	£10,288,000,000	£10,286,000,000	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the TfL (lines (45) + (46) + (47) + (48) above)
(50)	-£6,945,000,000	£	estimate of TfL’s income not in respect of Government grant or precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(51)	-£3,337,000,000	£	estimate of TfL’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(52)	£0	£	estimate of TfL’s income in respect of redistributed non domestic rates, revenue support grant, police grant and GLA general grant calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(53)	£0	£	estimate of TfL’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (45) and (46) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(54)	-£10,282,000,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for TfL (lines (50) + (51) + (52) + (53) above)
(55)	£6,000,000	£4,000,000	the component council tax requirement for TfL (being the amount by which the aggregate at (49) above exceeds the aggregate at (54) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The draft component council tax requirement for TfL for 2012-13 is: £4,000,000

Part 6: The Greater London Authority ("GLA") draft consolidated budget

NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If "nil" or "£0" is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
Line	Mayor's proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(56)	£934,784,687	£932,274,687	the GLA's consolidated council tax requirement (the sum of the amounts in lines (11) + (22) + (33) + (44) +(55) calculated in accordance with section 85(8) of the GLA Act

The draft consolidated council tax requirement for 2012-13 is: £932,274,687