****

**VALE OF GLAMORGAN AND CARDIFF**

**REGIONAL COLLABORATIVE COMMITTEE**

**Minutes 4 March 2014**

**Present:**

Cllr Lynda Thorne – CCC (Chair)

Cllr Bronwen Brooks - VGC

Sarah McGill – CCC

Mike Ingram – VGC

Ceri Meloy - Cymorth

Helen Jones – CHC

Mark Sheridan – CHC

Richard Vaughan – CHC

Donna Lemin – Welsh Government

Dr Sian Griffiths – Public Health Wales

Angela Stephenson – C&VUHB

Neil Sutcliffe – CCC

Pam Toms – VGC

Sarah Capstick – RDC (minutes)

Bethan Jones – CCC

Angela Bourge - CCC

Arabella Owens – Mid & West Wales

RDC (Observer)

Sam Williams – Western Bay RDC (Observer)

**Apologies:**

Frances Beecher –Cymorth (Vice-chair)

Chris Maggs - SPNAB

Sian Harrop-Griffiths – C&VUHB

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda item** | **Action** |
| 1. **Welcome, introduction, apologies and declaration of interest**   The Chair was delayed in arriving to the meeting, so SC welcomed everyone and introductions were carried out. During the introductions the Chair arrived and apologised for arriving late.  Apologies were received and noted.  All declarations of interest are completed and up to date. |  |
| 1. **Cardiff Young Persons services review**   BJ and AB presented a paper with an update on what has happened so far and the 4 options that were presented to a meeting with providers which took place on the 25 February. 20 people from 14 different organisations attended the meeting on the 25 February 2014.  4 options:   1. Standard Framework – used in other council services, all costs are clear. It is very transactional led and not based on individual needs. 2. Lead Provider model – one provider (could be the Council) are the first point of contact and manage the referrals etc to pass onto other providers who are contracted to the lead provider. 3. Collaborative model – Would involve amalgamating all services into one package and then having partners working together to develop a bid, or it could be developed collaboratively once partners are identified first. 4. Dynamic purchasing system – etendering, similar to approved providers.   At the provider meeting the collaborative model was preferred, but more detail is required on what it would look like and how it would work. Issues identified include, the need for equality of all providers irrelevant of size of organisation, need for clear governance. Having one lead organisation could work if they only dealt with referrals and admin and left assessments and service delivery to the other providers.  Collaboration needs to be at the heart of the new system whichever option is chosen, along with a need for more information sharing.  MS – Will the review help with the SP cuts or is it looking at additional savings?  BJ – There are no budget cuts being managed through the review.  AB – Focus is on getting quality for money. Currently don’t have the best value for money so looking to change this.  BJ – Want more to be spent on frontline services, in tailored services to individuals and less to back office costs.  MS – Can see problems with option 2 (Lead Provider Model), option 3 appears to be the best, but option 4 may link in with work being done by Welsh Government.  DL – Accreditation was discussed at the last SPNAB meeting and advice will be put to the Minister to agree the way forward.  Welsh Government SP are looking at the possibility of setting up an etender database just for SP services which would have all the information LAs require from providers before tendering.  If it was to go ahead it would require all LAs to sign up to it.  The providers would be responsible for keeping their information upto date on it.  There is no indicative timetable yet.  DL – Is the review covering Cardiff only.  BJ – We have met with PT from the Vale of Glamorgan and we have visited the one-stop shop as a best practice example.  PT – A lot of the work Cardiff are now doing has already been done in the Vale following the Southwark judgement.  BJ – The Vale are sharing information with us and we will share information as we progress.  LT – Is option 4 (Dynamic purchasing) not an option now?  BJ – Not at present as it requires a longer commitment which services currently can’t be commissioned on.  CM – Is the review still on track with the original timescales?  BJ – The options appraisal will be taking place in early April. A few more considerations to be looked into. Having a lead provider as the frontdoor who then refer to other providers providing services needs to be looked into. If collaborative model then it would include the in-house council services, so would need more specialist information and assistance to set up the system.  SM – There are a lot of details still to be worked out. There is a need to reduce complexity and have the young people at the centre of all services.  AB – We need to explore option 3 more. Collaborative services on a smaller scale have been more innovative and person centred, but can that be upscaled? Which ever option is chosen will affect the complexity, there is a need to get it right and have the right providers on board. No one provider at the meeting could have provided all the services, so there will have to be some joint working and collaboration whichever option is chosen.  HJ – It is important that the services currently being provided are mapped to see how they currently work and how best to commission,  AB – Trying to avoid affecting floating support as aware of the review of SP floating support which is currently in the planning stages.  AB – The providers who attended the meeting on the 25 February will be involved in the process and kept informed.  Agreed that the BJ and AB attending the RCCs is the best way to keep the RCC up to date with the review.  BJ and AB then left the meeting. |  |
| 1. **Minutes and Matters Arising**   No amendments to the Minutes of the meeting on the 7 January 2014 were raised.  The minutes were approved.  SC raised that the DL had provided the details of who is on the Finance Workstream but she has yet to forward these to the RCC members.  DL asked about the group to be set up to look at the RCP for 2015/18. Agreed SC to contact FB about this so the process can be started.  **Action**  SC to circulate information on the members of the Finance Workstream.  SC to contact FB about the formation of a group to develop the RCP for 2015/18. | SC  SC |
| 1. **RDC report to the RCC, including the work plan and Welsh Government notices.**   The RDC report including the Welsh Government notices were issued prior to the meeting. No questions were raised about the information.  SC and DL raised the importance of responding to outturn and spendplan requests for approval. Quorate approval is required before they can be submitted to Welsh Government. Revised template for the 2014/15 spend plan will be out shortly for approval by the RCC members. DL confirmed that the new template spend plans do not need to go back to the LA Cabinets.  Workplan 2013/14 issued prior to the meeting was reviewed no comments.  Draft Workplan 2014/15 was issued prior to the meeting. DL recommended adding in the timeline for the RCP development to the workplan was agreed (item 3)  Workplan for 2014/15 approved.  **Actions**  2014/15 Spend plan to be issued by SC and all members to respond as soon as possible.  Timeline for RCP developments to be added to the 2014/15 workplan once known. | All  SC |
| 1. **Supporting People Participation and Involvement Framework.**   CM introduced the framework which has been developed by the task and finish group. Would like to thank the members of the group for their work in creating the framework, who came from the Parents Federation, The Wallich, Gwalia, Hafan and Dimensions.  The framework finishes on page 7, with more detail along with hints and tips in the appendices. A tree diagram has been developed to demonstrate the framework as well.  The framework requires regular reporting on compliance from LAs and providers.  An easy read version will be developed once it has been approved.  SG – There are a few minor amendments to be made which will be fed directly to CM.  No other comments and the Framework was approved including the summary.  The draft action plan was introduced and any comments or feedback were requested especially on if the timelines were acceptable. No comments and the action plan was approved.  **Action**  Easy read version of the Framework to be created. | SC |
| 1. **SP Lead update**   Papers were circulated prior to the meeting.  ***Vale of Glamorgan***  PT raised two points from the Vale part of the report.   1. The top priority in the LCP is being looked at to commission, but depends on funding being identified by Health. If health are unable to fund the care element of then the second priority in the LCP will be commissioned. 2. All former SPRG contracts are due to expire this year, so they will all need to be retendered. They have all received the maximum extensions allowed.   In addition PT informed the RCC that the Extra Care support tender process had now been completed with Hafod Care the successful provider.  CM – Will the tendering process be staggered or prioritised?  PT – The SPRG contracts start to expire from October 2014 and so will be prioritised based on when they are due to expire. The preferred provider commissioning framework will be out of date so it will be a full commissioning process.  PT agreed to bring how the commissioning process will be carried out to a future RCC.  ***Cardiff***  NS informed that the Complex Needs project tender stage has been delayed pending confirmation of the care funding element.  Learning Disabilities Supported Living Service contracts have been directly awarded to incumbent providers with effect from February 2014 to end July 2015. Within the council a project group has been set up to manage the process of commissioning new services.  Cardiff Tenant support services has changed as a result of budget and staff reductions from April 2014. Providers are now carrying out support needs assessments instead of the council team. Where a service is offered following assessment we aim for the assessing provider to provide the actual support but this may not happen in all cases.  HJ – What are the LD timescales?  NS – It is intended that providers will be appointed by April 2015 to allow for handover/transition if there is any changes in providers.  HJ – Assessments, how is that working with providers?  NS – Idea is to limit duplication, there is only the cost of time to the providers in carrying out the assessments. It has only started a few weeks ago, so there is no feedback yet.  DL – Is there a clear audit trail for if something goes wrong? How is it being assessed for outcomes?  NS – SP team will still be checking the assessments and the support plans.  MS – Assessment should be person led anyway.  DL – Looking for assurances that you and the provider are confident and that what is being delivered is right for the individuals.  PT – It is down to the LA to review, the Vale reviews all providers annually.  NS – In Cardiff the large number of projects makes reviewing services annually very challenging and insufficient resources to do this. However we are planning a rolling programme of reviews through a provider risk matrix.  HJ – It could be detrimental to the individual if the referrals for assessment are not in the area of expertise of the staff and provider the assessment is passed to.  MS – There need to be lots of checks on the services.  RV – Most providers review themselves annually as well.  DL – Need to make sure that outcomes and wellbeing are measured. Need to show progression is being made with the funding that is being spent.  **Actions**  Vale of Glamorgan to bring information on how they are going to commission all the SPRG contracts which are due to expire this year to a future meeting. | PT |
| 1. **Collaboration, Good Practice and Innovations**   A paper was circulated in advance of the meeting.  SC shared the Orange Wallet scheme, including what the orange wallet looks like. The Cardiff press release is due to take place on the 5 March 2014 involving train and bus companies. |  |
| 1. **Any other business**   **8a. Cardiff Homelessness letter to other councils dated 28/1/2014**  LT provided background information for the letter, a copy of which was circulated prior to the meeting. It was agreed by the Hub steering group and was as a result of there not being enough places for Cardiff people because of places being taken up by people from outside of Cardiff. The idea of the letter was to start a discussion and so far Cardiff have received two responses asking for meetings to discuss it further.  DL – Are there any timescales?  LT – Not yet, as we are in the early exploratory stages.  SM – Nottingham have come to an agreement with their surrounding areas so that the burden of cost is not all on Nottingham City.  LT – Looking at the possibility of a similar scheme to Nottingham so there is shared responsibility. Already been raised by at least one other LA.  LT – Requested the data information on the homeless figures and where the last known address area was. Once information is received this will be shared with the RCC.  HJ – Does it include Domestic abuse?  LT – It does not include domestic abuse.  MS – SPNAB are looking at the redistribution formula again, to see if the burden on cities like Cardiff were correctly taken into account.  SM – Was there a specific problem with the letter.  SC – There appeared to be confusion around the last sentence on the first page “We have the support of our local housing-related support providers…”. People incorrectly assumed that it had come from SP.  HJ – Providers thought the Reps had approved it without it first going back to the Regional Provider Forum.  LT – Apologised for the incorrect wording.  **8b. Cardiff Supporting People Contracts**  HJ raised an issue from the Regional Provider Forum that there are services being provided in Cardiff without contracts.  NS – The suggestions from the meeting in July were being taken forward, but some of the clauses still needed to be approved.  HJ – Is there a timescale for when they will be approved.  NS – No timescale at the moment.  DL – Is this all SP contracts?  NS – All except LD contracts. All of the old SPRG contracts which came over from Welsh Government. All new services have contracts.  MS – Biggest issue for providers in the draft contracts was no get out clause for the providers  **8c. Vale of Glamorgan One-Stop Shop**  A paper was circulated in advance of the meeting.  MI stated it is part of the Councils response to the Housing Bill, looking at a Hub type service similar to the one Cardiff already have.  Visibility study has been commissioned and Andy Gale has started work on it, and due to report in June. A housing strategy event took place in the Vale of Glamorgan on the 19 February 2014 which included feedback about the possibility of setting up a one-stop-shop. Looking to formulate a steering group to develop this further, but we are aware that there are some people missing from the group. Requesting a provider/RCC rep to join the steering group.  All the reps nominated FB. As FB was not present at the meeting, MI agreed to contact her to see if she would be willing to join the steering group.  **Actions**  Homeless data which led to the letter being issued to be shared once available.  Cardiff contracts to be followed up.  FB to be contacted about joining the Vale of Glamorgan one-stop-shop steering group. | LT  NS  MI |
| 1. **Agenda items for the May 2014 meeting**   All of the items were agreed for the next agenda, with the following to be added to it.   * Outcomes to be led by DL * Governance to be led by DL * YP service review update – BJ and AB to be invited   **Actions**  BJ and AB to be invited to the May RCC meeting.  Agenda for next meeting to be set and circulated. | SC / NS  LT / FB / SC |

**Date of Next Meeting**

2pm, Tuesday, 6 May 2014

Armstrong Room, Wilcox House, Cardiff