

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet

Meeting held 17 October 2018

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Olivia Blake, Lewis Dagnall, Jackie Drayton, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Chris Peace, Jack Scott and Jim Steinke

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Jayne Dunn.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 The Chair (Councillor Julie Dore) reported that Appendices 3-10 of item 12 'Future of the Revenues and Benefits Service' and Appendices 1-3 of item 13 'Care at Night Service' were not available to the public and press because they contained exempt information described in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person. Accordingly, if the contents of those appendices were to be discussed the public and press would be excluded from the meeting.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 19 September 2018 were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Public Question in respect of Gender Pay Gap

5.1.1 Christine Rose commented that the Women's Equality Party were pleased to note that the Council had a relatively small gender pay gap for its own employees. However, the Council spent millions of public money outsourcing and procuring services via private companies. Could the Council therefore give the gender pay statistics for the five largest Council contracts of 2017/18? Could these be broken down both by the financial cost of the contract and by the number of employees delivering the contract, stating the name of the company/organisation and the service they provided?

5.1.2 Christine Rose further asked could the Council also tell us whether an assessment of the gender pay gap formed part of the procurement process for evaluating bids and submissions, including renewal and extensions of contracts? If this was not currently part of the evaluation and procurement process, how was

the Council going to ensure that it was in the future?

5.1.3 In response, Councillor Olivia Blake, Cabinet Member for Finance, commented that this was a really important issue and she was happy that the gender pay gap at the Council was small. However, the Council did have a number of contracts but had recently insourced some of these. 3 of the 5 main contractors for the Council had representatives who sat on the Council's internal Equality Board where questions were asked in relation to equality.

5.1.4 Councillor Blake added that information in respect of this could be found on the gender pay gap website but she would write to Ms. Rose with the breakdown. There were significant differences in the pay gap between the 5 main contractors. Equality in respect of pay was not able to be included as part of the procurement process due to the need to follow the national procurement regulations of 2015 and the regulations would need to change for this to be considered. However, the Council did use an ethical procurement toolkit with its suppliers.

5.2 Public Question in respect of Asset of Community Value Application

5.2.1 Nigel Slack commented that there had been a great deal of comment on social media both from the Friends of Birley Spa and others about their application for an Asset of Community Value Assessment. The implication was that this had failed at the first hurdle. In Mr Slack's opinion this appeared to be another disposal where the view put forward by Cabinet was at odds with disposal practice by officers. What was the latest on Birley Spa and the Asset of Community Value application? Was there a clear and understood protocol for the disposal of heritage assets that officers should adhere to? If so, could that protocol be published for the benefit of the public and particularly for local community groups that may have had an interest?

5.2.2 Councillor Jim Steinke, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, responded that he had not signed off the decision in respect of this as yet. He had had the relevant legal briefing and met with Councillors and Officers. However, he couldn't prejudice the decision at this stage, but when the decision was made it would be made public. There was a heritage category being developed and this would be published.

5.2.3 Councillor Olivia Blake added that the Council had a disposals framework which applied to all assets, which had been agreed in 2013 by her predecessor. This was publically available and could be made available for Mr Slack. An Informal Planning Note for applications was usually produced which took into account conservation issues.

5.3. Public Question in respect of Streets Ahead Contract

5.3.1 Nigel Slack commented that the Streets Ahead Contract had been in the news again for what appeared, to Mr Slack, to be manipulative changes of work schedules to ensure that Amey avoided penalties. Mr Slack believed that they may even have gained financially by hitting changed targets.

- 5.3.2 Mr Slack commented that two quotes from the article which he had provided Cabinet with a link to were particularly relevant: “Initially, it was believed by some Councillors, Amey would resurface 100 per cent of the roads in the first five years. They then said they would finish 70 per cent in that time period. Nick Hetherington, network asset manager at Amey, had since confirmed they had only done 65 per cent to date.” Nigel Slack commented that this descending target was also confirmed to him in answers to public questions by the previous Cabinet Member for Environment.
- 5.3.3 The article further stated that “Mr Hetherington denied the team being behind schedule but admitted to changing their programme to meet targets.” Mr Slack therefore asked what information could the Council share about this practice and whether Council contract management facilitated such changes? Could the Council confirm whether Amey received penalties or rewards for their work in their ‘core investment period’?
- 5.3.4 Councillor Lewis Dagnall, Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, responded that the truth was less sensational than the quotes referred to by Mr Slack suggested. There had never been a prescribed target for the percentage number of roads completed in a fixed time. There was an average condition score awarded in terms of resurfacing and it was estimated that 65-70% of roads would be improved within that core investment period.
- 5.3.5 Councillor Dagnall added that Amey carried out a condition survey each year to assess whether roads had deteriorated or improved. This was necessary as it ensured Amey focused on roads that had deteriorated. Microsurfacing brought roads up to standard before a full resurfacing took place. The Council also took samples from roads to ensure the condition was acceptable.
- 5.3.6 Councillor Dagnall added that Amey had met all of their targets within the core investment period and had received a contract uplift. This would have worked the other way round if Amey had not met their targets. Streets Ahead was a 25 year programme which will have a long term impact and would get roads up to a standard and be maintained at a standard not previously seen in the City. Councillor Dagnall was satisfied with the way the programme operated to deliver a sustainable operative network for the Council and concluded by commenting that he could not be held responsible for misunderstandings of the way the contract operated.
- 5.4 Public Question in respect of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- 5.4.1 Nigel Slack commented that he had spoken with the relevant Cabinet Member about concerns over consultations falling short of their target audiences recently and he had identified that there had been issues with both Council blogs and the consultation hub website, probably due to General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) issues. Mr Slack had been told that these would be addressed.
- 5.4.2 Mr Slack then stated that he would also like to focus on the issue of some consultations seeming to lack sufficient information for the Cabinet to take the best decision. For example, the consultation with respect to the Community

Infrastructure Levy, item 9 on the agenda for today's meeting. Mr Slack understood and applauded the proposal to make this a redistributive approach, even if he might disagree about how this was applied. However, if he were making a decision on this today he would want some additional information.

5.4.3 Mr Slack therefore asked as more 'Neighbourhood Plans' were developed what will be the impact of this on the redistribution aspect of the scheme? What information was there about the money collected through CIL on different areas or Local Area Partnership (LAP) areas and therefore what 10% of that CIL neighbourhood portion (being the minimum local retention) actually amounts to? Finally, with recent contention over the existence or otherwise of actual Equality Impact Assessments, could a copy of EIA report 286 be available at the meeting?

5.4.4 Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, responded that there was a risk with Neighbourhood Plans that some neighbourhoods could approve plans that would allow them to retain a higher amount of money. There was the further risk of more affluent areas being able to develop neighbourhood plans and poorer areas not able to which would widen inequality. Information in respect of Ward distribution had not been made available as the policy decision had not yet been made. Within the next two-three weeks more information would come forward and be made available. However, things changed on a daily basis. The Equality Impact Assessment was circulated to Cabinet and made available to Mr Slack.

5.5 Public Question in respect of Community Infrastructure Levy

5.5.1 Mike Hodson, representing Carter Knowle & Millhouses Community Group, asked was the Cabinet Member aware that the high rate of response to the consultation that is cited in the CIL report, in answer to criticisms of the poor publicity etc., is largely due to the last minute publicity given to the consultation by local community groups? The top 6 Wards accounted for virtually 50% of the responses despite the fact that:-

(a) information about the consultation only reached many of these groups a few days before it was scheduled to close, owing to failures in the system of notifications by Citizen Space and Local Area Partnership Blogs;

(b) the publicity was largely confined to social media; and

(c) responses to the consultation were only possible online, thus disenfranchising a substantial minority of citizens who lacked either the means or the confidence to make use of electronic communications?

5.5.2 Mr Hodson further asked if the Cabinet Member was satisfied that the consultation was entirely in accord with the Council's own guidelines for such consultations in that:-

(a) the proposals were not clearly at a formative stage – as they included detailed principles and evolved proposals for all three of its aims;

(b) sufficient reasons (and background information) were not included – e.g. there were no figures or examples of how alternative methods of distribution might impact on different areas of the City;

(c) adequate time was clearly not given - as the consultation period was only four weeks, as against the usual, and recommended six weeks; as it started in the middle of August when many people were likely to be away; and for those who had only heard about it days before the response period ended, it was merely a few days; and

(d) the product of the consultation did not appear to have been conscientiously taken into account – in that on the key proposition of adopting a distribution model across the whole City using the Index of Multiple Deprivation, only 45% supported it, with 53% feeling unable to do so?

Mr Hodson asked, as a follow up, would the Cabinet Member not agree that were the Council to make more use of local community groups plus other more traditional methods as additional channels of communication, their aim to involve and empower local communities – as expressed in aim number 3 of the consultation – might be better achieved?

- 5.5.3 Councillor Jack Scott stated that he was encouraged by the response rate to the consultation and this compared well to similar consultations. He accepted the point about GDPR in that, as a result of the new regulations, the Council had to delete a database of email addresses that it had built up and was now having to rebuild that. This consultation was the first to take place since that had been done. The only mitigation possible was to extend the deadline to respond to the consultation which the Council had done.
- 5.5.4 Councillor Scott added that it was not uncommon to receive last minute responses and differences in the responses between areas. However, there was a correlation of support for the proposals. Councillor Scott was confident that the consultation was adequate in this instance and took into account the more deprived areas in the City. The proposals outlined in the consultation had not been decided and it was agreed that a further discussion would be held at the end of the consultation. As a result of the consultation the Council had gained good qualitative and quantitative information.
- 5.5.5 Councillor Scott recognised that CIL was a complicated process and the questions posed in the consultation contained background information to allow people to make a judgement. It would not be fair to say that 30% neither agreeing nor disagreeing means the Council should not proceed with the proposals, as these people were not disagreeing with the proposals. Councillor Scott thanked Mr Hodson for the work he did with the Carter Knowle and Millhouses Community Group and agreed that such organisations were a vital part of how the Council engaged with local people.
- 5.5.6 Councillor Scott acknowledged that CIL was a contentious issue but was confident in the consultation that had taken place. He welcomed the input from the Carter Knowle and Millhouses Community Group and would welcome similar input from

other community groups. He respected people who had a different view, but believed implementing the proposals was important if the Council wanted to tackle significant inequality in the City.

5.5.7 Councillor Jim Steinke thanked Mr Hodson and other community groups who encouraged last minute responses to the consultation. Many of the responses were supportive of the Council's proposals, especially in areas where people may not appear to benefit from them.

5.5.8 The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, commented that she was not surprised to see support from people in areas who may not appear to benefit from the proposals as she believed that Sheffield people understand the importance of fairness and redistribution was a part of that. However, she recognised that in some localities further work needed to be done to address some issues with developments and this could be done through the planning process. The Council was always looking to improve engagement with communities and individuals who didn't engage with the public service, and the democratic process. If anyone had any suggestions as to how to increase dialogue with these people she would be happy to hear them.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

6.1 There were no items called-in for Scrutiny since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

7.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report on Council staff retirements.

7.2 **RESOLVED:** That this Cabinet :-

(a) places on record its appreciation of the valuable services rendered to the City Council by the following staff of the People Services Portfolio:-

<u>Name</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Years' Service</u>
Karen Barker	Senior Teaching Assistant Level 3, Norfolk Park School	23
Anne Broadhead	SENCO Teacher, Ecclesall Infant School	37
Marjorie Reilly	Supervisory Assistant, Malin Bridge Primary School	20

(b) extends to them its best wishes for the future and a long and happy retirement;
and

(c) directs that an appropriate extract of this resolution under the Common Seal of the Council be forwarded to them.

8. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD PORTION

8.1 The Executive Director, People Services submitted a report seeking (a) approval for the process for allocating the “Neighbourhood Portion” (currently 15%) of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts within Wards that are not within a Parish Council boundary or an area in which a neighbourhood plan is in place; and (b) delegated authority for decisions on the spending to be granted to the Head of Libraries, Community Services & Learning & Skills, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (i) agrees that where there is no Parish Council or neighbourhood plan in place in the Ward where a chargeable development has taken place, the Neighbourhood Portion is collected into a single Local CIL pot and redistributed using the process set out in the report;
- (ii) delegates authority to the Head of Libraries, Community Services & Learning & Skills, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, to determine: (A) how the CIL Neighbourhood Portion allocated to each Ward is spent, following engagement with local communities and Ward Councillors, subject to the proviso that monies are spent in accordance with agreed Ward Priorities and (B) to determine the terms on which such expenditure is incurred including authorising the completion of any related funding agreement or other legal documentation; and
- (iii) delegates authority to the Head of Libraries, Community Services & Learning & Skills to produce a Guidance Note for Councillors and Officers, setting out how decisions on spending the CIL Neighbourhood Portion will be made, based on the details set out in the report.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 The recommendations made in this report are considered to be in line with the CIL Regulations and have been made with regard to the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

8.3.2 The proposals that were consulted upon received broad support and so form the basis of the recommendations.

8.3.3 The allocation of some of the Neighbourhood Portion based on Indices of Multiple Deprivation provides an opportunity to close the gap between richer and poorer areas of the city.

8.3.4 The existing Ward based approach to community engagement and funding is an efficient mechanism for these decisions. Adopting a similar approach for decisions on the spending of the Neighbourhood Portion would enable better coordination with other Ward based funding.

8.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 8.4.1 The Council must ensure the Neighbourhood Portion is spent appropriately in accordance with the CIL Regulations and have regard to the NPPG. The options available are alternative methods of allocating neighbourhood CIL, such as different governance mechanisms and/or different geographies.
- 8.4.2 The entirety of the Neighbourhood Portion could be retained in the Ward where the development has taken place but this would remove the opportunity to close the gap between the richer and poorer parts of the city.
- 8.4.3 Delegations to other officers were considered but the recommendation that the Head of Libraries, Community Services and Learning & Skills, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, is authorised to make these decisions is considered the most appropriate option and would align the Neighbourhood Portion with other Ward based funding.

9. **ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY AND CALL HANDLING SERVICES TO SUPPORT PEOPLE IN THEIR HOMES (CITY WIDE CARE ALARMS - KIT/CALLS PROJECT)**

- 9.1 The Executive Director, People Services submitted a report outlining the methodology for re-tendering kit/calls contracts and seeking permission to proceed. Two key contracts are due to expire at the end of April 2019. The first is for the provision of assistive technology (kit) in people's homes. The second is for the provision of call handling services (calls) connecting people using assistive technology to a call centre. Both contracts (kit and calls) are key pillars of the Council's Social Care provision.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) agrees that ESPO (Procurement Services for the Public Sector) be utilised to procure both contracts to commence in May 2019, based upon the current delivery model and in line with the report;
- (b) delegates authority to the Executive Director, People Services, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, to award such contracts, and thereafter to enter into such agreements to secure such services, detailed and in line with the report; and
- (c) delegates authority to the Executive Director, People Services, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, to carry out such activities, where no existing authority exists, in order to meet the aims and objectives of the report.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 9.3.1 This proposal is the preferred option because the delivery model is tried and tested with the lowest cost/risk factors and the proposed procurement of the

service will enable increased flexibility and innovation and at the same time allow integration opportunities and rationalisation of services to be explored.

9.3.2 The outcome will be new assistive technology and call handling (kit/calls) contracts that are:

- More flexible and sustainable
- Innovative and up to date
- Customer focused and responsive
- Providing the right kit, to the right people at the right time
- Empowering - enabling greater independent living
- Supportive - helping vulnerable people and their carers
- Preventative - preventing falls and social isolation
- Investing to save - enabling future savings via prevention

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 Two further options were considered for both the call handling and equipment contracts:-

- Extension of existing contracts for a set period of time was considered. However, this option was rejected because it is not commercially or legally compliant. In addition it fails to provide the flexibility and innovation required of the contracts moving forward.
- Open tenders for both contracts. This option was rejected because even though it would offer greater flexibility, it would not allow for further market testing to take place, or testing to understand the actual cost of provision. It would also prevent any opportunity to integrate the current services with other activities and other strategic partners.

10. **MONTH 5 CAPITAL APPROVALS**

10.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme as brought forward in Month 05 2018/19.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposed additions and variations to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 1 of the report, including the procurement strategies and delegates authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts;
- (b) gives authorisation to accept the grants from the Environment Agency as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report;
- (c) gives authorisation to accept the grant from the Marine Management

Organisation (MMO)/European Maritime Fisheries Fund if the key features of the grant are as outlined in Appendix 2 of the report; and

- (d) delegates authority to the Director of City Growth, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance, to decide whether or not to accept the Marine Management Organisation (MMO)/European Maritime Fisheries Fund grant in the event that the key features of the grant are not as outlined in Appendix 2 of the report.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 The proposed changes to the Capital Programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield.
- 10.3.2 To formally record changes to the Capital Programme and gain Member approval for changes in line with Financial Regulations and to reset the Capital Programme in line with latest information.
- 10.3.3 Obtain the relevant delegations to allow projects to proceed.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 A number of alternative courses of action are considered as part of the process undertaken by Officers before decisions are recommended to Members. The recommendations made to Members represent what Officers believe to be the best options available to the Council, in line with Council priorities, given the constraints on funding and the use to which funding is put within the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.

11. **FUTURE OF THE REVENUE AND BENEFITS AND FINANCIAL BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS SERVICES**

- 11.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report containing proposals in relation to the future delivery of the Revenue and Benefits and Financial Business Transactions (FBT) services.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes and approves the proposal for the future delivery of the Revenues & Benefits & FBT services outlined in this report and in particular that:

- these proposals would move the Council towards the delivery of those functions through an in-house service;

- this will necessitate early termination of the Revenues & Benefits

and FBT elements of the Programme Agreement with Capita Business Services Ltd (Capita); and

- there may be a transfer of staff from Capita into the Council that will require a formal consultation with staff affected and the Trade Unions.

- (b) to the extent not covered by existing delegations, grants delegated authority to the Executive Director of Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, the Director of Finance & Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance, as necessary, to:
- approve the procurement strategies and contract awards for the various procurements required to deliver transfer and ongoing delivery of the services;
 - utilise the appropriate contractual mechanisms to give notice to Capita to terminate the Revenues and Benefits and FBT services and Partnership elements of the Programme Agreement; and
 - take such other steps as he feels necessary to achieve the outcomes in the report.
- (c) gives approval for the budget required to cover the costs of delivering the transfer of the Revenues & Benefits and FBT services to the Council, including the one-off implementation and set-up costs, as set out in the financial implications of the report; and
- (d) notes that a further report will be presented to Cabinet in due course setting out the strategy for the future delivery of the services in more detail once the proposals have been fully worked up.

11.3 Reasons for Decision

- 11.3.1 The detailed rationale for the recommendations is set out in the report. Insourcing the services will give the Council direct control over the delivery of Revenues, Benefits and FBT services, especially given the changing political and legal factors around Welfare Reform and Universal Credit. It will enable the Council to implement the necessary changes to transform the services to adapt to these environmental demands in the most effective way we see fit and deliver these changes more quickly and more cost-effectively than if the services were managed by a strategic partner. This option gives us the opportunity to take back control over the future direction of the services and continue to deliver high performance through our own workforce.

11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 11.4.1 Four other options were shortlisted for detailed analysis:
- 'Do nothing' and allow the contract to run until 2022.

- Reprourement of all services.
- Hybrid Delivery
- Renegotiation

12. CARE AT NIGHT SERVICE

12.1 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted a report requesting authority and approval for Sheffield City Council (“SCC”) to jointly commission with Sheffield Clinical Commissioning Group (“SCCG”) for the provision of a revised night visiting service, called ‘Care at Night’.

12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) approves the recommendations made by the Executive Management Group (“EMG”) of the Better Care Fund, on 5th September 2018, in relation to the commissioning, contracting, financial and risk arrangements for the Care at Night service which will be, subject to approvals and agreement from both SCC and SCCG, covered and funded under the existing Framework Partnership Agreement relating to the Commissioning of Health and Social Care Services (“S75 Agreement”); with EMG’s recommendations including:

(i) approval for a revised night visiting service (now called “Care at Night”) to be jointly commissioned between SCC and SCCG;

(ii) approval for the Care at Night service to be managed on a ‘Jointly Managed Scheme – Integrated Commissioning Arrangements’ basis within the S75 agreement; and

(iii) approval for the costs of the jointly commissioned contract for the Care at Night service to be shared between SCC and SCCG on a fixed % contribution basis which is expected to deliver a 50:50 sharing of the modelled savings. The proportionate share of costs would be split into 60% SCC and 40% SCCG. The risk-share for any future increase in costs, such as additional rounds, will be in line with the percentage splits above.

(b) delegates authority to:-

(i) the Executive Director, People Services, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance, to vary the S75 Agreement and any other

necessary documentation that are required in order to give effect to the implementation of the EMG's recommendations as set out above;

- (ii) the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, in consultation with the Executive Director, People Services, to procure the proposed service and approve the procurement strategy; and
- (iii) the Executive Director, People Services, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance, to:-

(A) approve the terms of the variation to the S75 Agreement and enter into all necessary documents (such as deed of variation) in order to add the Care at Night service to the S75 Agreement, in line with this report;

(B) approve the terms and enter into the new contract for the Care at Night service; and

(C) take all other necessary steps not covered by existing delegations to achieve the outcomes outlined in this report.

12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

12.3.1 The proposed jointly commissioned Care at Night service will aim to achieve the following outcomes:

- Individuals benefit from continuity of care without the need to change care provider should their eligibility for CHC services change.
- Individuals and their families have a strong voice enabled through provider-led regular quality check surveys which helps to monitor service quality and inform continual service improvement.
- People are supported to get home more quickly from hospital by providing short-term support, including wraparound care as required.
- Systemic pressures are reduced and better outcomes for people achieved, for example, by enabling a family carer to have a short break or get a good night's sleep, without the cost and upheaval associated with admitting the cared for person to a care home.
- The service represents value for money with service costs reflective of both the market value and the health and social care activities being delivered.
- Savings for SCC and SCCG are potentially achieved.
- New ways of joint working are tested as a staging post on the journey to

fully integrated commissioning, by working through the challenges and capturing the lessons learned on a relatively small project.

- A unified, consistent approach to pricing and contract management for night care is implemented.
- A platform for further potential developments is created, for example incorporating the overnight elements of the CWCA and Intensive Home Nursing Service, which may realise additional structural benefits and citywide savings in future, and deliver a better experience for users.

12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

12.4.1 Do not provide a night care service after the existing contract is due to expire at the end of March 2019: This is not a viable option. The individuals requiring care and support during the night are often among our most vulnerable citizens. While opportunities to increase independence and reduce the amount of care required will be actively explored as part of the new arrangement, not having any night care in place is likely to result in individuals being placed in residential settings or being admitted to hospital, which is not acceptable from an operational perspective, nor a reasonable or desirable outcome for individuals and their families.

12.4.2 Procure contracts separately from the CCG: For the reasons outlined elsewhere in the report, to continue to procure contracts separately removes the opportunity to make collective savings and deliver a more efficient service which is better for individual users, and contradicts the national direction of greater integration of health and social care services.