

### Appendix 3: specific feedback about options for services commissioned from the independent market

<p><b>Option 1: maintain the status quo.</b> SCC would continue to work with the independent marketplace 'as is' with no significant change.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of key stakeholders commented this option would result in minimal disruption and change for people who use services, their carers and providers.</li> <li>• A majority of key stakeholders commented they believed the services were already subject to inspection, due to the fact they are providing support to 'vulnerable people' and the level of expenditure and were 'shocked' they were not. A few key stakeholders asked if quality standards could be introduced without contracts – whilst this would theoretically possible there would be no grounds from compliance.</li> <li>• A number of key stakeholders commented that the price charged and the type of activities should be designed and implemented by the provider, as opposed to the Council, which would continue within this option. Noting their concern involvement from the council ay negatively impact the offer.</li> <li>• A number of key stakeholders commented they did not understand the current price differentials in services (noting they were unclear if they were driven by complexity or quality).</li> <li>• A number of key stakeholders commented they did not feel the current inequity in respect of individuals financially contributing to various aspects of the day was fair and should not continue.</li> <li>• A few key stakeholders commented this would align to their business model / plan. And continue to deliver their service.</li> <li>• A number of key stakeholders commented that they were concerned this option would continue to mean inconsistency and inequity of practice, with people who are exploring services not being aware of all options to enable them to make an informed decision (this impacts negatively on providers and the individual).</li> <li>• A number of key stakeholders commented they either did not wish to manage a Direct Payment currently or in the future and wished for the Council to take over management of this budget – this would result in an increased number of 'invoice led' provision (non-contracted).</li> <li>• A number of key stakeholders commented the price charged for a number of day services had not increased / changed in several years, however this would likely require review for a number of people based on the pressures being faced in the marketplace – historically there has not been a single point of contact or consistent mechanism to resolve this and this option would continue this, which could be detrimental to the marketplace.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 2: introduce rates and proportionate contracting.</b> The Council would devise and implement a clear service specification with set rates and a formal procurement, contracting and quality assurance arrangements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of key stakeholders commented they felt the introduction of contracts would be positive:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Quality standards and monitoring;</li> <li>○ Clear Service Specification and Accountability;</li> <li>○ Clarity – what the offer does and does not include, meaning personal contributions are fair and equitable;</li> <li>○ All providers would be aware of future care packages and have an opportunity to respond (fair competition);</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A few stakeholders commented they were worried the introduction of contracts and different ways to buy the service would impact negatively on the autonomy and creativity of the providers and customers being able to exercise choice.</li> <li>• A number of key stakeholders told us they were worried about any procurement / tender / contract process being onerous and time consuming, which could negatively impact on the actual delivery of services.</li> <li>• A number of key stakeholders told us they would welcome the introduction of contracts as this would mean they would not need to manage a Direct Payment in future.</li> <li>• A number of key stakeholders commented they felt the introduction of set rates would be fair and equitable – and stressed the importance of these being representative of needs and sustainable.</li> </ul>

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A few key stakeholders told us they were worried the introduction of rates would mean a change in their business model.</li><li>• The majority of providers told us the suggested rates included in the survey would not deliver a safe service.</li><li>• A number of key stakeholders told us they did not feel the introduction of one rate for all people, based on the different needs of people, would work.</li><li>• A few key stakeholders told us they were worried about who would decide the amount payable / banding awarded and the timeliness of this process.</li><li>• A few key stakeholders told us introduction of a rate would mean a reduction in the number of days they could attend a service.</li><li>• The majority of key stakeholders commented that a Dynamic Purchasing System would be the preferred procurement mechanism – primarily as it would allow providers to join at any time, thus not limiting choice.</li></ul> |
|--|---|