

Appendix 4: potential ability of options for services commissioned from the independent market to meet Programme outcomes

Outcomes	Option 1: maintain the status quo	Option 2: introduce rates and proportionate contracting
To take into account the feedback received from key stakeholders to strengthen and improve opportunities to meet assessed eligible care and support needs and outcomes	No. Whilst there was some level of support for this proposal, concerns were raised about current arrangements including that the service offer is not clear, rates are not fair or equitable, and there is a lack of regulatory and quality oversight by the council.	Yes. This option had some support, although key stakeholders stressed the importance of rates being representative of needs and sustainable, and highlighted some potential risks including a reduction in customer choice, compromising the autonomy and creativity of providers, and potentially onerous processes of procurement and contracting
To ensure 'The Offer' is fair, transparent, sustainable and proportionate to meet assessed care and support eligible needs	No. There are no service specifications and services may not be consistent with people's assessed care and support eligible needs. The council would not wholly be fulfilling their statutory duties.	Yes. A clear service specification would be developed to reflect people's assessed eligible care and support needs.
To maintain and strengthen the quality of support, establishing clear contracting mechanisms, with proportionate quality monitoring / assurance	No. There are no proper contracting or quality assurance arrangements in place.	Yes. Formal arrangements for procurement, contracting and quality assurance would be put in place.
To address the difference in price paid for the provision of services, ensuring a sustainable and fair marketplace.	No. The price for services varies massively and the prices are not consistently reflective of eligible needs or care; nor are they fair and consistent in regards of people's personal contributions.	Yes. Rate/s / a form of pricing strategy would be introduced to reflect users assessed eligible care and support needs.
To support people and services to shift from community presence to genuine community inclusion	Yes. The service would continue to support people to access the community – however it is noted there are variations in current practice.	Yes. A requirement to maximise community inclusion could be written into the service specification and monitored accordingly.
To contribute towards the £3.7million savings required for the Medium Term Financial Strategy	No. Without change no savings are possible.	Yes. Savings should be possible through introducing fair and equitable rates and avoiding overpayment whilst ensuring the sustainability of the market as a whole.

Feedback from key stakeholders about the introduction of rates and contracting

In our last round of engagement we asked key stakeholders:

Question	Response Overview
Do you agree with SCC's proposal to advise of a rate to buy day services?	<p>There was mixed feedback – the primary concern was about these rates being sustainable and designed in partnership.</p> <p>A number of key stakeholders told us it would be good to know what should and should not be included / paid for – ensuring everybody makes the same personal contributions.</p> <p>A number of key stakeholders told us it is important that the offer is fair and consistent.</p>
Do you think there should be one rate or a number of rates i.e. based on needs?	The majority of key stakeholders told us they did not feel the implementation of a single rate was the right thing, based on the diversity and range of needs.
Do you think here should be a set rate or reference rates (like a range)?	<p>There was mixed feedback – noting the pros and cons of both options from different stakeholder perspectives. For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set Rates: a customer can express a greater degree of choice and control; all providers are on an equal 'footing'. 2. Reference Rates: a provider can have a greater say in respect of ensuring they can meet needs at a sustainable cost.
<p>Could a quality service be provided for the following amounts?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low Needs: £30 per day 2. Medium Needs: £49 per day 3. High Needs: £58 per day 	<p>The majority of key stakeholders told us they did not feel a quality service could be provided for this amount – particularly in respect to the Low Needs.</p> <p>A number of key stakeholders told us they thought the medium rate and above may deliver a quality service, dependent on the needs of the person.</p>
Do you think there any circumstances where SCC needs to pay more i.e. rural locations?	<p>There was mixed feedback in response to this question.</p> <p>Some key stakeholders thought if we got the 'rate' right in the first place, the council would not need to think about paying more.</p> <p>Some key stakeholders thought there might be times when we need to pay more to ensure a person</p>

	receives the right support.
<p>Do you think SCC should pay 51 weeks per annum?</p> <p>Do you think SCC should pay for services if somebody does not attend i.e. respite or illness?</p>	<p>There was mixed feedback in response to these questions.</p> <p>Some key stakeholders told us, regardless of when the services are open or closed or a person attends or not, the costs are proportioned over 52 weeks and so payment needs to be made to ensure businesses keep going.</p> <p>Some key stakeholders told us, there should not be a charge when the services are closed or a person cannot attend, particularly when plenty of notice has been given.</p>
<p>What pressures are you facing in the marketplace?</p>	<p>Some key stakeholders told us the predominant pressures faced are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National Living Wage Increases 2. Pension Contributions 3. Accommodation costs and associated utilities increasing (some people also told us the longevity of their accommodation wasn't always secure / known so this causes some worry).
<p>Do you agree with the Council's proposal to introduce contract?</p> <p>What type of contract...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Framework? 2. Dynamic Purchasing System? 3. Other? 	<p>The majority of key stakeholders agreed with this proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would promote competition 2. People can still use a Direct Payment 3. It can monitor quality of services 4. Providers will have a point of contact to discuss day to day issues with – the contract could include annual increase discussions. <p>The primary concern is that people still wanted to express as much choice and control as possible.</p> <p>The majority of key stakeholders told us they liked that a Dynamic Purchasing System allowed providers to join at any time.</p> <p>A number of key stakeholders told us they were worried a Framework might be a bit 'restrictive'.</p> <p>A number of key stakeholders told us it is really important any contract (and using it) needs to be clear from the outset about what is wanted and needed and not a huge / difficult task to use.</p> <p>People said they would be willing to explore a contract / system that captured the above, as much as possible.</p>

