****

**VALE OF GLAMORGAN AND CARDIFF**

**REGIONAL COLLABORATIVE COMMITTEE**

**Minutes 22 July 2014**

**Present:**

Frances Beecher–Cymorth

Cllr Susan Elsmore – Cardiff

Cllr Darren Williams - Cardiff

Sarah McGill – Cardiff

Hayley Selway - VGC

Ceri Meloy – Cymorth

Jeff Gooch - CHC

Helen Jones – CHC

Mark Sheridan – CHC

Phil Richardson – CHC

Dr Sian Griffiths – Public Health Wales

Auriol Miller - SPNAB

Neil Sutcliffe – CCC

Kate Hustler - CCC

Pam Toms – VGC

Sarah Capstick – RDC (minutes)

**Apologies:**

Cllr Bronwen Brooks - VGC

Mike Ingram – VGC

Jane Thomas- CCC

Sian Harrop-Griffiths – C&VUHB

Donna Lemin – Welsh Government

**Did not attend:**

David Bebb - Probation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda item** | **Action** |
| 1. **Welcome, introduction, apologies and declaration of interest**   The Vice-Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that Cllr Brooks had unfortunately given her apologies for the meeting. As a result as Vice-Chair she would be chairing the meeting.  Introductions were made around the table  Apologies were received and noted. Donna Lemin gave her apologies due to other work priorities and reduced staff in the team. RCC raised concerns that the RCCs were not seen as a priority by Welsh Government.  The declarations of interest have to be completed by all Members, Deputies and Advisors every July. The Chair asked all those present to complete and return to SC by the end of the meeting.  **Action**  SC to request completed forms from all those not received by the end of the meeting via email, including those unable to attend. | SC |
| 1. **Minutes and Matters Arising**   No amendments to the Minutes of the meeting on the 6 May 2014 were raised.  The minutes were approved unanimously.  CM - Cardiff contracts are still outstanding for providers.  NS – there has been an issue with legal sending them out, they hope to start to send them out by the end of this week. As each has to be individually produced it will take a few days for them all to be issued.  FB – Confirmed that Cardiff had kept providers updated on delays and the clause allowing providers to terminate contracts is now included in the contracts.  NS – Confirmed that to be the case, and that the delay had allowed the clause regarding the 10% clawback for voids to be included.  SC – Clawback statement has been finalised with Cardiff, and is almost finalised with the Vale of Glamorgan, this will be done as soon as possible.  SC – Best practice examples of paper work from the Income maximisation, budgeting and debt training have not yet been shared. This will be done when the online toolkit is launched.  **Action**  Cardiff to provide contracts to providers.  10% void clawback statement for the Vale of Glamorgan to be finalised.  Best practice examples to be circulated through CHC and Cymorth to all SP funded providers and landlords in the region along with the link to the online toolkit, once it is available. | Cardiff  SC / PT  SC |
| 1. **RDC report to the RCC, including the work plan and Welsh Government notices.**   The RDC report and the workplans were issued prior to the meeting. SC asked the RCC how they want to make the RCC more strategic? There is a wealth of knowledge and experience around the table, can we use the time more constructively than we have up to now?  FB – We were one of the last RCCs to form, and up to now we have been focusing purely on compliance. It is a good time to start looking at doing this differently, especially when we know we are facing cuts in budgets for at least the next 3 years.  SE – What influence do we have and what should we have?  FB – Local decisions have to be made locally, but the RCC is expected to look at the larger region picture and influence on a strategic level.  A recommendation was made for the frequency of meetings in the RDCs report. The Members were asked for their thoughts.  MS – There is lots going on with the cuts and new legislation, the meetings should stay bi-monthly.  CM – Bi-monthly meetings should continue until things are more settled.  SM – We need a better structure of groups that work between meetings and do not need to request permission from the RCC. Then we could have quarterly meetings.  MS – Decisions need to be made swiftly, so waiting 3 months between meetings is too long at present. There needs to be an acceptance of co-production.  FB – Paper with advantages and disadvantages with the structures underneath needs to be done and brought back to this meeting. Until then the meetings should stay bi-monthly.  [agreed unanimously]  FB – the update includes the letter from Ceri Breeze about the reasons for the reduction in allocations. Does anyone want to discuss this now? If so due to a conflict of interest SC will leave the room.  No discussion was requested.  The amendment to the Welsh Government update was read out:  “**Housing (Wales) Bill** - the Bill has successful passed stage 4. The Bill is now in the four week period of intimation, during which the Counsel General or the Attorney General may question whether the Bill, or any provision of the Bill, would be within the Assembly’s legislative competence to the Supreme Court for decision (section 112 of the Government of Wales Act). If this stage is passed, Royal Assent is estimated to take place in early to mid September.”  HJ – Can the RCC look at the impact of the Housing Bill at the September meeting? [agreed unanimously].  Paper to be prepared for the RCC by HJ, PT, Natalie Southgate (NaS) and SC.  **Actions**  Paper to be created with input from Members, Deputies and Advisors on the frequency of meetings (bi-monthly or quarterly), also any suggestions on the structure that should sit under the RCC (to include existing task and finish groups).  Meeting dates to be set for November 2014 and January 2015 and circulated.  Meeting frequency after January 2015 to be agreed at a future RCC.  Housing (Wales) Bill to be added to the September agenda items.  Paper on the Housing (Wales) Bill to be prepared for September meeting. | SC / All  SC  SC  SC  HJ/PT/NaS / SC |
| 1. **2012/13 and 2013/14 Outcomes report**   A report was circulated with the papers. In addition SC provided a short presentation to the RCC on Outcomes, handout of slides provided.  SE – Is there a benchmark?  FB – There isn’t a benchmark as services are person-centred.  HS – Seems to be a disconnect from the Minister between wanting person-centred services but generalised Outcomes. There needs to be a way of joining these up.  FB – We are expected to provide person-centred services and have base costs. How can we do both?  MS – We need to have 2 different systems.  FB – There are 3 years of cuts coming unless we come up with ideas. We have to be solution focused.  HS – There needs to be leadership on evidence.  FB – How do we want to take it forward? Find out what work is already being done and what can be done.  SE – What is being done across Wales?  SC – All regions are expected to look at the Outcomes, we are one of the first RCCs to receive a report.  FB – It would be good if we could take a lead on evidencing SPPG.  SG – There is a danger of the data being skewed due to the gaps in it.  CM – Outcomes are a requirement by Welsh Government. Cardiff SP team are doing validation work on the figures.  FB – We need to start the work and then escalate it up, have leadership on what could work. At present more is being pushed onto the LAs. Everyone needs information to give the evidence. Can we look at it, as an RCC?  HS – We should gather best practice from across Wales and have a group that looks at it. We could come up with a suggestion and be the pilot for it.  SM – We do provide person-centred services, as it is at the moment it is too big and needs to be broken down into client groups. If we focus on one-client group, take responsibility through a task and finish group.  SG – A step-by-step process could be developed, which could then be applied to other client groups.  HJ – Group could have short and long term aims.  SG – Those aims could be different.  FB – Create what we think is appropriate, what will allow the LAs to make decisions.  Unanimously agreed to set up a task and finish group, with both LAs involved. Those interested in being part of the group to let SC know by the 29 July 2014.  **Action**  Names of those interested in being on the Outcomes task and finish group to notify SC by 5pm on the 29 July 2014.  First meeting of the Outcomes task and finish group to be arranged.  Outcomes task and finish group to be added to the September agenda items. | All  SC  SC |
| 1. **Outturns: 2013/14 annual and Quarter one 2014/15**   2013/14 Outturns were circulated with the agenda.  [Approved unanimously]  PT – In the 2013/14 Outturns, the Vale of Glamorgan had a £65k underspend. If the money does not get clawed back by Welsh Government, then the Vale would like to use it to increase the number of units with existing services, covering all client groups to reduce the waiting lists.  NS – Cardiff have contacted Welsh Government directly to ask if it would be possible to have the Vale’s underspend as Cardiff overspent in 2013/14.  PT – Why did Cardiff not contact their regional partners?  NS – We were only asking if it was possible.  PT – Due to budget cuts there are limited new services, but there are lots of service users already waiting for existing services who could use it.  FB – Recommendation is for the Vale of Glamorgan to expand services to lower the existing waiting lists. [Approved]  2014/15 quarter 1 Outturn was circulated with the agenda.  [Approved unanimously]  FB – We need to have strategic discussions around how we use the Outturns going forward.  **Actions**  Approved Outturns to be sent to Welsh Government.  RCC decision on Vale underspend to be communicated to WG. | SC  SC / FB |
| 1. **Task and Finish group updates: RCP and Older persons services**   Papers were circulated from both task and finish groups with the agenda.  SM – Can we have the names of the people in the task and finish group on future documents?  SC – Yes, sorry that I didn’t include them this time.  ***Older persons services***  SM – There is already lots of work going on in the LA for Older persons services. SP is not in isolation, there are multiple funding streams for services.  FB – It all needs joining up. Can the Chair of the task and finish group meet with the relevant people in the LAs and then bring it back to the next RCC?  Timeframe for task and finish group not approved. HJ to meet with KH and HS to find out what is being done locally and what the RCC needs to do.  PT – We do need to remember that there is a specific requirement in the guidance for the RCC around older persons services.  ***RCP***  FB – Do we have a regional outlook on what SPPG funding should be spent on? When the SPPG replaced the previous funding streams, a previously closed loophole was re-opened for ongoing care rather than support. Funding before was either to support progression or to stop a decline. Without clarity as an RCC the cuts could result in services being spread so thinly they are no longer viable or effective.  MS – The SPPG budget is facing 3 or 4 more years of cuts. In the past SP was seen as being able to do everything. There is no appetite centrally to give specific guidance as any decision should be based on local needs. It is probably too late for 2015/16 but for future years we should look at what we want SP funding to be targeted at.  FB – There needs to be strategic discussions as we will need to make difficult decisions. If funding is spread too thinly and doesn’t evidence the benefit then there is a real danger funding will be cut further. If regionally we have agreed it will aid in the priority setting locally as well.  SM – Any decisions locally will be shared with the RCC. We are not about cutting everything. We need to keep services that will make a difference, quality rather than quantity.  AM – The SPNAB perspective is about your freedom to make decisions across the region.  PT – Where do SPNAB see local decisions being made? There is a worry that there is a disconnect between the LA planning group and the regional perspective.  FB – Welsh Government and SPNAB provide the direction across Wales. The RCC gives the direction for the region, but local decisions are still down to the LAs.  HS & SM – SP is not in isolation.  MS – There are parallel messages coming from SPNAB and Welsh Government. The Minister sees SP as a subset of homelessness.  FB – Both LAs have already started the planning process for the year.  MS – The RCC has been focused on process up to now. It is time to be more positive and proactive.  SE – Will meet with the Vale Cabinet Member as a starting point.  AM – There is an opportunity to identify the overlaps with other budgets.  CM – Are there any extra actions we could take to start building those networks?  PT – Joint reviews could be a quick win.  SM – Agree it is a useful way forward.  **Actions**  Contact details to be shared with HJ for KH and HS.  Meeting to be arranged to identify what is being done locally and what else needs to be done around older persons services.  Revised paper on the time frame for the task and finish group to be brought to the September RCC for discussion.  Cabinet Members with responsibility for SP to meet.  Joint reviews to be planned and started. | SC  HJ/KH/HS  HJ/KH/HS  ES / BB  PT / NS |
| 1. **Cardiff Strategic direction**   KH presented to the RCC a presentation provided to the Regional Provider Forum on the 11 July 2014. The slides were circulated in advance of the meeting.  MS – Danger of setting a single cost for generic floating support, as some will be low level support and others are higher levels of support, what the services are providing needs to be looked at in more detail. There are a range of services covered under the heading.  FB – Having standard support periods a standard length, is not person-centred.  KH – Support lengths will be able to be extended.  SM – There are different levels of support provided through services. Similar services do seem to have large cost differences.  HJ – In regards to the Review of Frontline/Direct Access Hostels, those affected last year were given 3 years protection from further cuts.  KH – That is not correct, had we had to carry out the worse case scenario then they would have been protected. As we didn’t they are not protected from further cuts.  FB – Please can the providers involved have this communicated to them as soon as possible, by Cardiff. This will allow the reps to provide any support required and for any confusion to be removed.  SM – Alignment and pooling of budgets is being focused on. Aiming to provide certainty and sustainability for some services. The reviews do not just involve SP funding.  FB – The RCC needs to sign off the approach. At what stage does the RCC need to sign off any cuts? Can you come back with details of how and when the RCC is expected to do so. There needs to be more detail given on the approach been taken, including dates.  HS – Would it be possible to share the approach in August in advance of the meeting in September? This would allow initial comments and make sure nothing is missing. [confirmed]  HS - The information given today does not mention anywhere about talking with the other LA in the region and where regional engagement is planned in. The strategic approach needs to be signed off by the RCC.  MS – The RCC does not sign off the exact cuts, just the strategic approach being taken.  [SE and SM left the meeting]  **Actions**  Cardiff to notify the Frontline/Direct access hostel providers who had cuts last year, that they are not protected from further cuts for 3 years.  Cardiff to provide more detail including dates for the approach being taken through a paper to the RCC Members in August in advance of the September RCC.  Agenda item to be added to the September RCC meeting. | KH/NS  Cardiff  SC |
| 1. **LA quarterly updates**   Paper circulated with the agenda.  PT – We are about to start retendering a service. It is a service run currently by Gwalia which was set up before SPPG and cannot be extended further. We will be following the Vale’s commissioning procedure, with 4 providers invited to tender, the top 3 from the preferred provider register and the existing provider.  FB – At the first RCC meeting we discussed the waste of resources in retendering where there is no need to do so.  PT – SPNAB were meant to be looking at how to resolve the issue, but with no progress, we have to follow the LAs financial regulations.  FB – The RCC needs to push for SPNAB to take action on this.  NS – The information for Cardiff was also circulated and we have discussed a lot of the issues already, so nothing more to highlight.  MS – Are Cardiff SP funding a Floating Support service for people with mental health issues that is currently out to tender?  NS – The service referred to will not be receiving any SP funding.  MS – There appears to be some confusion, from another meeting I attended. I will make sure any incorrect information is corrected.  [FB left the meeting and CM took over Chairing the meeting] |  |
| 1. **Vale and Cardiff RCC Communications Strategy**   The draft of the Communications Strategy was consulted on in June. The revised draft was circulated with the agenda.  No additional comments or amendments.  Unanimously approved.  [KH left the meeting]  **Actions**  Communications Strategy to be taken out of draft and added to the RCC website. | SC |
| 1. **Governance**   The revised MoU has not been issued following the stakeholder feedback. Agreed to delay this item until the MoU is available.  **Action**  Governance to be added to a future RCC once the revised MoU is available. | SC |
| 1. **Collaboration, Good Practice and Innovations**   Paper with information on the Gwent Review Officer Group (GROG). Sharing of information and ideas at an operational level.  NS – Information on organisations is going to be the same, but reviewing individual services is where there will be differences.  PT – When reviewing a provider you are likely to only review a percentage of the services, there is no reason why the percentages could not be applied across both Cardiff and the Vale.  (Joint service reviews already agreed to take place earlier in the meeting.) |  |
| 1. **Any other business**   **12a. RCP and Annual Review feedback**  Papers circulated with the agenda.  SC - Some of the other RCCs have decided to provide feedback on the feedback.  CM – Main criticisms appear to be around data information and strategic thinking.  HS – There seems to be confusion over what they are asking for and what they are receiving due to constraints of templates.  Agreed to do a short written response to Welsh Government.  **Action**  Draft response to the RCP and Annual Review feedback to be drafted and circulated for comment.  Revised response to be sent to Welsh Government.  **12b. Williams Commission**  Agenda item originally requested by Cllr Thorne. Welsh Government’s White paper is currently out for consultation and was circulated with the agenda. Welsh Government are saying for the RCCs business as usual for now.  **12c. SPNAB update**  AM – SPNAB needs to improve communication with the RCCs and we are working on this, a brief summary of what is happening:   * Transition review feedback to SPNAB is due in September. * Research and development – longitudinal study is due to start from April 2015 onwards. * Service User Involvement is high on the agenda, looking to set up two events, one in North and in the South. No plans in place yet. | SC  SC |
| 1. **Agenda items for the September 2014 meeting**   Agenda items listed for the September meeting were all agreed. A number of agenda items have been added throughout the meeting.  NS – BDO will hopefully come to the next meeting and provide feedback on the work they have been doing.  **Action**  Agenda for the September meeting to be set and circulated. | BB/FB/SC |

**Date of Next Meeting**

2pm, Tuesday, 2 September 2014

Armstrong Room, Wilcox House, Cardiff