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**VALE OF GLAMORGAN AND CARDIFF**

**REGIONAL COLLABORATIVE COMMITTEE**

**Minutes 2 September 2014**

**Present:**

Cllr Bronwen Brooks – VGC (Chair)

Cllr Susan Elsmore – Cardiff

Mike Ingram – VGC

Jane Thomas- CCC

Ceri Meloy – Cymorth

Helen Jones – CHC

Mark Sheridan – CHC

Phil Richardson – CHC

David Bebb - Probation

Donna Lemin – Welsh Government

Chris Maggs (CrM) - SPNAB

Neil Sutcliffe – CCC

Pam Toms – VGC

Sarah Capstick – RDC (minutes)

**Apologies:**

Frances Beecher - Cymorth

Jeff Gooch - Cymorth

Cllr Darren Williams - Cardiff

Sarah McGill – Cardiff

Dr Sian Griffiths – Public Health Wales

**Did not attend:**

Sian Harrop-Griffiths – C&VUHB

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda item** | **Action** |
| 1. **Welcome, introduction, apologies and declaration of interest**   The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and especially David Bebb from Probation.  Introductions were made around the table.  DB – Thank you for the welcome. Probation is undergoing significant changes and is being split into two parts. DB is the Assistant Chief Executive of the new Wales Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC), with responsibility for the Cardiff and Vale CRC.  Apologies were received and noted.  CM provided her apologies that she would need to leave the meeting at 15:45. |  |
| 1. **Minutes and Matters Arising**   No amendments to the Minutes of the meeting on the 22 July 2014 were raised.  The minutes were approved unanimously.  DL – In response to the concern raised at the last RCC that the RCCs were not seen as a priority by Welsh Government, DL asked for clarification if this was a wider issue or in response to WG not attending 1 meeting. As it was the latter DL advised that the team have been understaffed and have been at around 15% of capacity and had to prioritise work as a result.  BB – Have the staffing issued eased?  DL – Hoping to recruit 3 vacancies shortly. Also there is a restructuring within the team which will include a permanent Data and Governance Post. Hopefully this will give more stability to the Welsh Government team and the support for the programme.  SE – We have made approaches to meet with BB but have yet to hear anything.  BB – Due to illness there has been a delay, but it is in hand and a meeting will be arranged shortly.  SC – Still waiting for the webpages to go live connected to the Income Maximisation, Budgeting and Debt Management training. As soon as they are live the best practice papers will be circulated, I will be chasing this up later this week.  JT – Confirmed that Cardiff have emailed the Frontline/Direct Access hostel providers who had cuts last year, to state that they are not protected from further cuts for 3 years.  **Action**  Meeting between the Cabinet Members from both Local Authorities to take place.  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. | SE / BB  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 along with the Welsh Government update.  DL – In addition to the information circulated the SP team at Welsh Government have produced a document based on the Outcomes information which covers LAs, RCCs and Welsh wide information. The document will not be published but will be released as a working document. It is going to the Chair and Vice-Chair meeting on the 4 September for comments, then to SPNAB and then onto the Minister. There is also a spend plan analysis working document which is under development.  SC – The paper asks the RCC for comments on four questions.   1. *Co-opting a member from the Police and Crime Commissioners Office.*   BB – We could ask for some information to make an informed decision.  CM – We could invite them to carry out a presentation on their priorities.  SE – Agree with the suggestion to ask them to carry out a presentation.  BB – SC to write to invite them to present with their priorities and to open up the opportunity to share information.   1. *Creating a Vale and Cardiff RCC strategic connections map.*   SC – The map enables the reach of the RCC to be identified and also any gaps as well.  DL – It would be really helpful, it identifies the links and encourages 2 way communication between different groups if the same person sits on both.  CM – It will demonstrate how well connected the RCC Members are as well as allow any gaps to be identified.  MI – There may be a link to the LSB and how to make structures available.  JT – Similar in Cardiff.  CrM – It will show complexity, but it will take time to complete.  Agreed unanimously for SC to start creating the strategic connections map, acknowledging that this will take a number of months to complete.   1. *Any specific tasks not currently taking place by the RDC that the RCC would like the RDC to be working on.*   HJ – Suggested anyone with any ideas to feed them into SC in the next two weeks.  JT – Best practice and information on service user engagement.  CM – We already have the Participation and Involvement Framework which is due to be fully implemented in October. It could be a good time to reactivate the task and finish group.   1. *Content for the RCC annual newsletter*   SC – The newsletter will include a letter from the Chair, information from the Outcomes as well as some case studies. The newsletter will be written with all stakeholders in mind.  SE – Can the newsletter map the priorities from the Minister?  HJ – Could there be a brief synopsis from all the task and finish groups?  SC – Can the chairs of each of the groups write the synopsis.  DL – Need to make sure it includes providers and service user involvement.  CM – Ask for some case studies once know areas we want to cover.  BB – Please can any other suggestions be made to SC by the end of this week?  **Actions**  SC to write to the South Wales Police and Crime Commissioners Office and invite them to attend a future RCC to do a presentation on their priorities.  SC to contact the LSB officers about the strategic structures across both Councils.  Map of strategic connections to be started for the RCC Members.  Service User Involvement task and finish group to be reactivated.  All suggestions for the RCC newsletter to be sent to SC by the 7 September 2014.  RCC newsletter to be published electronically by the end of September 2014 | SC  SC  SC  SC  SC  SC |
| 1. **Cardiff Strategic direction update**   Consultants Gleny Lovell and Antonia Jeans from BDO joined the meeting to present on the Supporting People Review Phase II they have been undertaking for Cardiff.  Two documents were handed out: *Cardiff Council Review of Supporting People Programme: Phase II Supporting People Funding Priorities (August 2014)* and *Supporting People Review: Phase II Findings and Recommendations: RCC (2 September 2014)*  Cardiff SP will spend over £18million for 2014/15, funding 117 projects across 8 different areas: Frontline; All floating support; Domestic Violence; Young People; Older Persons, Physical Disabilities and Alarms; Learning Disabilities; Mental Health and Substance Misuse; and Ex-offenders, Families, Chronic Illness, other. There is a significant spend of over £8million on Frontline and Floating support services.  Cardiff are looking to model services for up to 10% being cut and making sure SP is more strategically spent. To start the process BDO met with all floating support providers individually and mapped out 38 customer journeys. Three slides of findings were then shared, the first on how SP has evolved organically and is not tailored to current users’ needs, through duplication of support between SP and Statutory services and an over-provision of specialist services. The second on a lack of clarity around how SP services should be delivered, with limited data to evaluate whether projects provide value for money and that support timescales are not defined.  MS – Timescales in SPPG were removed as they were too dogmatic and are against the principles of person-centred services.  BDO – High intensity short term projects may be more cost effective.  HJ – Danger is if support is provided for too short a period there is a danger of getting a revolving door scenario.  PT – If support is pulled too soon then all momentum can be lost and all the good work can be undone. All of the points raised should be picked up in service reviews which should be being carried out by the SP team.  JT – We have found some people who could have moved on but who hadn’t.  CM – People get stuck in some services because there isn’t the move on accommodation available.  The third slide showed that SP services are not funded strategically in Cardiff, including SP seen as a top-up rather than as strategically relevant. Four recommendations. a) Prioritise preventative services which demonstrate value for money.  DL – How have service users been involved?  NS – It has mainly been providers and other LA departments up to now.  DL – Can see you may be heading in the right directions, possibly not when it comes to the timescales which appears to take it away from person-centred services.  Four recommendations. b) Clarify the role of SP, who it is for and which services it should provide.  CM – You mentioned a duplication of services. We often deliver our services to different people.  BDO – There should be more opportunity to signpost.  JT – Signposting will ensure that people know where to go next time that the same problem occurs.  MS – Cardiff appear to be moving the boundaries. To mitigate housing issues providers were pushed to help clients complete benefit claims, for this purpose portable IT equipment was purchased by providers and we work with a client to complete their claim in such a way that next time they need to complete the form they will know how to do it and should be able to do it themselves using publically available IT equipment (eg in libraries).  [SE left the meeting]  CrM – Things go round in cycles. Funding of benefits advice was reduced so capacity overall needs to be looked at and considered.  BB – There is a danger that if a vulnerable person is signposted, but do not take it up then they fall through the net and are left more in danger of becoming homeless.  JT – We don’t want to encourage dependency on services but on independence.  BDO – There doesn’t appear to be a process set out for how people can be stepped down, so people can move on to the next stage towards independence.  Four recommendations. c) Remove duplication and better match supply with demand. d) Services are commissioned through joined up working and with an outcomes focus. [end of presentation]  CrM – SP is part of a larger jigsaw of services. Technology doesn’t appear to be high on the agenda for this review, the focus seems to have only been on people and staff.  JT – Supporting older people through technology is already in place.  MS – There are examples where technology is being engaged with elsewhere, for example using Skype face-to-face calls rather than travelling to meet individually every time. It is time to shift our thinking on how services are delivered. The direction of what is in the presentation isn’t a concern, however what comes next is unclear. What is the plan? And there is no indication of dates for implementation of changes.  JT – We plan to use September to discuss in more detail with providers and by the end of September to be able to go out with the detail.  MS – It still seems vague.  JT – We are trying to do it strategically.  MS – How will it be done strategically?  NS – We are doing benchmarking and looking to identify which services are not a priority. This will then provide us with ideas which we can implement to manage any required cuts.  MS – Last year Mike Friel brought forward the method that was to be used for the RCC to agree. This year we have not received this and we need it as soon as possible now.  JT – The method is to look at benchmarking and priorities.  MS – Can we have a special meeting to cover the methodology including dates?  SC – Methodology and dates were asked for at the last meeting and is an action on page 8 of the minutes for a paper in August and discussion at this meeting.  DL – An extra meeting for both LAs to bring their methodology of cuts is a good idea.  MS – We are asking for the methodology and not to make the decisions which is the responsibility of the LA.  JT – We can produce a paper for circulating, but we need to press on with discussing with the providers.  CrM – There is a meeting of SPNAB with the Chairs and Vice-Chairs on Thursday which will discuss some parts of finance, but no figures will be known. 9 LAs definitely have a cut and if there are additional cuts then it could impact on all 22 LAs. How LAs are going to manage this needs to be explained. Communication needs to be better between the LA and the RCC.  CM – There needs to be clarity on how providers will be met with. Individually or in groups?  JT – We have been waiting for the BDO report. We can communicate more and we will produce a document that sets out the methodology clearer. Depending on the impact of the possible cuts will influence how we meet with individual organisations, some will be in groups and others individually.  SC – On page 35 of the BDO report [dated August 2014], it states “*When discussing support timeframes, providers agreed with the need to focus more on outcomes, rather than the support timeframes set out in their current projects.”* This would appear to contradict what you are recommending.  BDO – Outcomes are different and no one has it tied down. There is no contradiction, services should be outcomes focused and there should be set timeframes to match person-centred outcomes.  CrM – Strategically outcomes are important. There is a risk that if services are funded based on outcomes results that there is an incentive to provide false outcomes.  [BDO consultants left the meeting with NS]  **Action**  Cardiff to provide a paper for the RCC on the methodology being used and the proposed dates, as soon as possible.  Extra RCC meeting to take place at the beginning of October for both LAs to share the methodologies and if appropriate for them to be agreed by the RCC to be set up. | SE/SM/JT  All |
| 1. **Cardiff Learning Disability supported living service update**   Item deferred to the November RCC meeting, as no one from the review team were available to attend.  **Actions**  Item to be added to Novembers agenda | SC |
| 1. **Housing (Wales) Bill**   Paper was circulated with the agenda prior to the meeting.  HJ – The paper was produced following a meeting of myself with SC and PT. Natalie Southgate provided a paper on behalf of Cardiff which was the consultation feedback to the draft Bill.  MI – Since the paper was drafted the transition funding allocations have been received by the LAs and we are now discussing how it should be spent. The funding is revenue and not capital funding which is tapered over the next 3 years.  JT – Only 1 years funding has been provided, there is no certainty for the following years.  MI – There is potential funding over 3 years so gives the lead in allowing the LA to bear it in mind for planning.  PT – Major concern is the impact on SP services when there are budget cuts being discussed. Seems to be a disconnect between the Bill and cuts in SP. Increase in demand for services already seen due to Welfare Reform and this has the potential to also increase demand.  MI – The Vale met with a Private Landlord this morning, they want tenancies that can be sustained and SP is key to that.  HJ – The auditing of the Private Rented Sector (PRS) will add to LA duties.  JT – The LAs will need to check homes and provide support, it is not yet clear how much support will be needed for PRS tenants. There are large implications for the LAs.  HJ – There is a link between benefits, PRS and SP that could have an impact on the demands for services.  CrM – There appears to be different things going on across Wales but none of it currently seems to be joined up.  JT – The allocation of LA properties, homelessness and prevention services are all linked together.  [CM gave apologies again and left the meeting]  [Meeting remained quorate but no provider reps now present] |  |
| 1. **Older Persons Services task and finish group update.**   An updated paper was handed out.  SC – A meeting took place involving the Chair of the task and finish group and representatives from both LAs as requested at the July meeting. There are lots of things happening across both LAs around older persons services, but it was not felt that the purpose of the task and finish group (to identify a timeline for all older persons services to be based on need and not tenure) contradicted with any of these. The only amendment made to the aims and timeframe presented to the last RCC is to the second bullet point under the timeframe.  No amendments were raised.  Aims and timeframe unanimously approved.  **Actions**  Actions on the timeframe to be started by the task and finish group. | T&F group |
| 1. **RCP task and finish group update**   Paper circulated with the agenda.  SC – The task and finish group have not met since the last RCC, work has been ongoing as per the agreed timeframe for the group. Focus has been on needs mapping both local and regional and a meeting took place between the SP leads to identify any regional areas of work, which are included in the paper provided.  PT – At the last meeting it was agreed that we would look to carry out joint service reviews. NS made it clear at the meeting we had that this would not be possible at present and no service reviews are being undertaken in Cardiff. As a result, we are looking at the possibility of sharing completed reviews between the LAs, but this would need to be agreed by the providers.  SC – As there are no provider reps present, can I take this to the regional provider forum?  DL – Outcomes and service reviews are important evidence for SP.  MI – Is it possible to create a summary?  HJ – As providers provide different services in different localities, a service review in one area may not cover all services in others.  DL – I am aware some RCCs are creating Information Sharing Agreements.  MI – The current draft document needs to be put onto a WASPI template.  SC – This will be done as soon as possible, but not likely to be ready until much later this year or beginning of next.  Agreed for SC to ask the providers through the Regional Provider Forum.  [NS returned to the meeting]  **Action**  SC to ask for the sharing of service reviews to be discussed at the next Regional Provider Forum.  Draft Information Sharing Agreement to be moved into the WASPI format and recirculated for consultation. | SC  SC |
| 1. **Outcomes task and finish group**   Paper circulated with the agenda. First meeting due on 9 September 2014.  Objectives and members of the group were approved.  **Actions**  Outcomes task and finish group to meet for the first time. | T&F group |
| 1. **Provider / Landlord Rep update**   No update at present. |  |
| 1. **Future meeting frequency from January 2014**   Paper circulated with the agenda.  BB – Can we defer this item until the next meeting, due to a number of Members not being present?  Unanimously agreed to move this item to the November meeting.  SC – If anyone has any comments on the two options which they want included, please can you let me know by the end of September.  **Actions**  This item to be added to the November 2014 agenda.  Provide any additional comments on the paper circulated for this meeting by the end of September. | SC  All |
| 1. **Collaboration, Good Practice and Innovations.**   Paper circulated with the agenda, with details of a collaborative and innovative service which was presented to the North Wales RCC.  No further comments. |  |
| 1. **Any other business**   BB – The Chair read out the following:  **Helping people with mental health problems to find and keep a home**  Welsh Government Report exploring how integrated public services may better support vulnerable people with mental health problems to find and keep a home. The focus of public services included in the report include: Health, Housing, Social Care and the Third Sector.  SC to send out an email with the link to all Members.  PT – **RDC post funding**. We are still waiting on a response from Welsh Government. The post was originally funded until June 2015 and then changed to March 2015, despite communications we are still awaiting clarification on if the original agreement will be honoured.  DL – The RDCs all had different funding dates, so the aim was to try to provide them all with similar dates and provide stability to the RCCs. The transition review is reporting on RDCs as part of the review and there are Welsh Government officials looking into this at present. Hopefully some information should be provided to PT by the end of the week, as it has been ongoing since June 2014.  DL – I would like to thank the Vale of Glamorgan and Cardiff SP Lead officers for providing additional bits of information to me at very short notice.  **Actions**  SC to send out the link to the Welsh Government report on helping people with mental health problems to find and keep a home.  Update on RDC post funding to be provided to PT | SC  DL |
| 1. **Agenda items for the November 2014 meeting**   Agreed for SC and NS to discuss which of the Cardiff updates should come to the November meeting, with the LD update probably attending that meeting and the Young Persons Accommodation being added to the January meeting agenda.  The Chair thanked everyone for attending the meeting.  **Action**  Agenda for the November meeting to be set and circulated. | BB/FB/SC |

**Date of Next Meetings**

2pm, Tuesday, 4 November 2014

Armstrong Room, Wilcox House, Cardiff

2pm, Tuesday, 13 January 2014

Armstrong Room, Wilcox House, Cardiff