### WIRRAL COUNCIL

#### **CABINET**

### 17 MARCH 2011

SUBJECT:	PRINT SERVICES
WARD/S AFFECTED:	ALL
REPORT OF:	DIRECTOR OF FINANCE
RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO	CLLR. JEFF GREEN
HOLDER:	
KEY DECISION?	NO

### 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to confirm the charging policy for services provided by the Print Unit and to provide an update on the progress of the policy to replace small desktop and office printers with multi-functional devices, which are capable of copying, scanning, printing and faxing.

# 2.0 RECOMMENDATION/S

- 2.1 That Members confirm the charging policy for the Print Unit and reaffirm support for the agreed policies of:
  - The purchase of printers, scanners, copiers and faxes being controlled by the Print Manager.
  - Where cost effective, the replacement of desktop and small offices printers, copiers, scanners and faxes with multi-functional devices and the subsequent removal of the redundant devices.
  - The placing of all orders for printing through the Print Manager and Print Unit

### 3.0 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

3.1 To confirm the charging policy for the Print Unit and to ensure printing services are provided in a cost effective and ecologically friendly way.

### 4.0 BACKGROUND AND KEY ISSUES

4.1 The Print Unit operates as a traded service within the Authority. It is wholly funded by the income it receives by providing printing services to departments, schools and a few external companies. The established policy is to charge for services on the basis of incurred cost plus 10% for all external work. Any surplus income is held in a reserve fund to offset periods of poor trading and provide capital for replacement equipment.

- 4.2 The Best Value Review of Communications, carried out by Xerox during 2002/3, identified that by taking a centralised approach to the provision of printing then significant savings could be made. One of the key recommendations was the replacement of numerous individual office printers, scanners, copiers and faxes with a much smaller number of strategically placed multi-functional devices.
- 4.3 The report produced by Xerox identified almost 2,000 separate devices in use in offices, including over 1,400 desktop and office printers. Installation of multifunction devices has reduced the number of smaller printers in use to approximately 320. Additional cost savings can be made by a further reduction of these devices.
- 4.4 Cost savings are derived from the cost difference between consumable items used on the multi-function devices and small office printers. It is estimated that production of a single side of A4 output costs between 2.5p and 4.2p on small to medium sized printers, compared with between 0.35p and 0.5p on the multi-functional devices. Some smaller printers are not capable of producing duplex output, which increases paper costs and has a corresponding impact on carbon emissions.
- 4.5 The multi-functional devices have power saving features included as standard, which are not available on some smaller printers, and consequently they tend to use less power and contribute less to carbon emissions.

## 5.0 RELEVANT RISKS

5.1 That the policy is not fully implemented and the use of desktop and small office printers continues resulting in higher costs and higher carbon emissions.

#### 6.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

6.1 The Best Value Review of Communications considered the full range of printing options.

### 7.0 CONSULTATION

7.1 Consultations will be held with departments and schools to maximise the use of multi-functional devices where cost effective. There are no implications for partner organisations.

# 8.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR VOLUNTARY, COMMUNITY AND FAITH GROUPS

8.1 There are no implications for voluntary, community and faith groups.

# 9.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS: FINANCIAL; IT; STAFFING; AND ASSETS

- 9.1 Savings can be made by reducing the number of smaller printers in use. This is estimated to save £500,000 over two years.
- 9.2. ICT resources will be required to install and configure devices, which can be provided from within existing resources.

### 10.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no legal implications.

### 11.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 There are no equalities implications. Devices will be located so as not to disadvantage staff with physical impairments.
- 11.2 Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

(a) Is an EIA required?(b) If 'yes', has one been completed?N/A

### 12.0 CARBON REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

12.1 Carbon reductions can be achieved using the power saving and duplex printing features included in the multi-functional devices.

### 13.0 PLANNING AND COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

13.1 There are no planning and community safety implications.

FNCE/34/11

REPORT AUTHOR: Geoff Paterson

Head of IT Services

telephone: (0151) 666 3029

email: geoffpaterson@wirral.gov.uk

### **APPENDICES**

There are no appendices associated with this report.

### REFERENCE MATERIAL

No reference material was used in the production of this report.

### **SUBJECT HISTORY (last 3 years)**

Council Meeting	Date
Cabinet	10 December 2008