

**Core Strategy Group**  
**Thursday, 16 December 2010**  
**14.00 – 16.00 Waterton Lee, Invicta House**

<b>Meeting</b>	Core Strategy Group		
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	16 December 2010	<b>Meeting No:</b>	
<b>Meeting Place:</b>	Waterton Lee, IH	<b>Minutes By:</b>	Pam Bower
<b>Present:</b>	<b>Job Title:</b>		
Angela Slaven	Director of Youth Offending and Substance Misuse		
Claire Martin	Head of Supporting People		
Joanna Wainwright	Director, Commissioning & Partnerships, CFE		
Kevin Hetherington	Tonbridge Wells Borough Council		
Janet Walton	Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council		
Amber Christou	Swale Borough Council		
Bob Porter	Shepway District Council		
Gavin Missons	Sevenoaks District Council (on behalf of Pat Smith)		
John Littlemore	Maidstone Borough Council		
Hud Manuel	Finance Manager		
Howard Cohn	Kent Probation		
Pam Bower	PA to Angela Slaven		
<b>Apologies:</b>			
Paul Whitfield	Dover District Council		
Gary Peskett	Canterbury City Council		
Margaret Howard	Director of Operations, KASS		
Tracey Kerly	Ashford Borough Council		
<b>Next Meeting:</b>	<b>Monday 28 February 2011, Pendragon room, Invicta House, Maidstone at 10am.</b>		
<b>Distribution</b>	As above		
<b>Date Issued</b>			

Item No	Details of the Item/decisions taken	CSG Member responsible for action
1.	<p><b>Welcome &amp; Apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Paul Whitfield, Gary Peskett, Margaret Howard and Tracey Kerly.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Minutes of meeting – 2 November 2010</b></p> <p>The minutes were agreed as accurate.</p> <p><b>Matters arising:</b></p> <p>3(i) <u>Terms of Reference</u> This related to developing links with providers</p> <p>3(ii) <u>Terms of Reference</u> This work is on-going and a report will go to the February 2011 meeting of the CSG.</p> <p>5 <u>Comprehensive Spending Review</u> This is on the agenda for this meeting. CM advised that only one suggestion had been received from Ashford Borough Council which was a request to revisit extra care sheltered housing and the amount of money paid per week.</p> <p>Concern was expressed that the table indicating a level of spend for 2011/2012 that was distributed to attendees at the last meeting, was not emailed out to those who were unable to attend that meeting. Apologies were extended for this oversight. The meeting was advised that the situation has now changed and this would be covered under Item 5 of this agenda.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Commissioning Body Memorandum of Understanding</b></p> <p>The Group were advised that this document reflects the basis of the discussion at the last meeting which was to endeavour to streamline it and reflect that changes that that been made in grant conditions.</p>	

Item No	Details of the Item/decisions taken	CSG Member responsible for action
4. cont.	<p>During discussion the following questions/issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the document need to be more explicit about the relationship with the Districts and Boroughs and who has the authority to spend. Portfolio holders in the Districts/Boroughs may express surprise that this document is all there is.</li> <li>• Districts/Boroughs have no power to veto any money being taken out of the SP budget by KCC. In addition KCC have sole discretion on how the money is spent and the size of the allocation to each District/Borough.</li> </ul> <p>The group were reassured that at the last Commissioning Body there was consensus amongst the members that they were happy to work within the existing model for the time being and they also accepted that the MOU was not rigorous. It was agreed that the MOU needed a statement of words to the effect that the Commissioning Body aims to ensure the level of investment in the Supporting People Programme meets the needs of the people in Kent within a collaborative arrangement and in linking with the Locality Boards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kent Probation needs to be referred to as well as the Districts/Boroughs</li> <li>• If the MOU is changed does it need to come back to this group before it goes to the Commissioning Body in January?</li> <li>• Would we have to take the changed MOU to the Leader of the Council?</li> </ul> <p>The group were advised that a substantive piece of work was carried out for the Leader of KCC and interested Cabinet Members to enable them to understand the SP Programme prior to any decision being made re budget cuts. The paper was very well received and Members were astounded by the level of investment in both the public and the private sector and the span of services users. Very strong arguments were put forward and members now fully understand the agenda, particularly with regard to older people and mental health. It was agreed that a statement of purpose would be drafted and added to the MOU and that the MOU should be in the form of a document rather than a table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was it agreed that reps would take the document back to their organisation for sign off? If yes this would be a good opportunity get the programme on the agenda of all the Districts/Boroughs.</li> <li>• Could we be more formally constituted so that Districts/Boroughs can be involved in how the budget is delegated?</li> </ul> <p>This would need to be checked with Geoff Wilde in KCC's Legal Department. In addition it was felt that in light of the localism agenda, there would be resistance to this and it was suggested and agreed that the issue of collaboration and the MOU itself be incorporated into a paper to the Commissioning Body in January. If agreement was reached at that meeting then legal advice could be taken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it possible to ensure protection of the delegated monies throughout the year?</li> </ul> <p>This is not possible although we are always liable under the contractual arrangements.</p>	

Item No	Details of the Item/decisions taken	CSG Member responsible for action
4. cont.	<p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MOU to be refreshed into document format and a statement of purpose containing elements of the discussion at this meeting to be included</li> <li>• A paper to be produced for the Commissioning Body that poses the questions about delegation and authority.</li> </ul>	
5.	<p><b>Delivering the savings proposal</b></p> <p>The group were advised that this paper was drafted within the context of the indications around the level of funding that might come down to the Authority. With a potential cut in funding in the range 20 – 40% over 4 years this paper considered a mid-range figure of £7m over the 4 year period. The paper also considers other issues such as Payment By Results and managing cost shunting to Adult Social Services. It was hoped that members would see that the paper does not represent salami slicing and that considerable thought has gone into how Districts/Boroughs could manage the reductions. Providers are concerned about moving to Payments By Results as currently they are paid 4 weeks in advance and this would cease. In addition Supporting People deals with a complex range of needs and there is concern that some Providers might deal with clients who have less challenging needs and would therefore evidence better results.</p> <p>During discussion the following questions/issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Appendix 1 most of the targets are process ones and some qualitative ones should be included. Could the Commissioning Body determine some qualitative indicators? This is about contract management and if the overall performance framework ceases, under the localism agenda we will need to set our own indicators and the Commissioning Body may wish to set them around effectiveness.</li> <li>• We must be clear on how we define Payment by Results – be bold but cautious.</li> <li>• What are the implications of the cuts we are proposing for Services? The Group were advised that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Sheltered Housing – the threshold has been temporarily raised for many providers</li> <li>– Alarms – the real cost for an alarm is 0.50 so it is suggested that the current amount of £1.50 is reduced.</li> <li>– Handyperson Service &amp; Home Improvement Agencies – Discussions with providers about possible models have concluded that the Handyperson Service lends itself well to Payment by Results but there is a question as to whether they could use this model without any funding from the Supporting People Programme and the Districts/Boroughs. Home Improvement Agencies are more challenging and there be an argument for a more basic level of funding. In addition HIAs need to be re-tendered</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Item No	Details of the Item/decisions taken	CSG Member responsible for action
5. cont.	<p>so the market could be tested prior to re-tendering. A review of HIA is taking place so discussions will take place with District/Boroughs and a paper will go to the Commissioning Body in March.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What we currently spend, what we are proposing is cut and what options we have is not explained in the paper. KCC will send its budget book to print on 29 December and will publish the plan on 6 Jan and until then exact figures are unknown. After 6 January a paper will be drafted that will include detail on investment and hopefully this paper will not include any major surprises.</li> <li>• Young People's Services and cost shunting – should this all fall on Supporting People? The group were advised that talks will take place with CFE about the need to have their commitment to some of the funding for the assessment period.</li> <li>• Administration Costs – there was discussion around this at the last Commissioning Body meeting but this is not mentioned in the paper. The group were assured that there will be a need to evidence administration savings at the next Commissioning Body meeting. The role and functions of the team will determine the nature of the savings and there needs to be a transitional phase to ensure the team can manage all the savings that will need to be made. This was agreed. It was also agreed that a separate confidential paper will go to the Commissioning Body on this.</li> <li>• Is there agreement that re section 4 of the paper, this will go forward to the Commissioning Body as an options paper with some senesce of the impact that this will have on Service Providers and budgets? This was confirmed.</li> <li>• When re-tendering we must be more robust with regard to the proposals for tending. The group were advised that in the paper to the Commissioning Body there will be time line and the Commissioning Body will be asked to agree to the tendering for specific services at specific times.</li> </ul> <p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A separate confidential paper to go to the Commissioning Body in January regarding savings on administrative costs. The CSG accepted that there should be a transition period to reduce staff levels in recognition of the demands for retendering in 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year.</li> </ul>	
6.	<p><b>A.O.B.</b></p> <p><u>Howard Cohn</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where are with the contracting of Floating Support Services? District/Borough based Floating Support contracts will not be renewed after the end of March 2011. There</li> </ul>	

Item No	Details of the Item/decisions taken	CSG Member responsible for action
6. cont.	<p>will be a residual number of contracts that relate to East, West and Countywide covering specialist and generic services and there will be a proposal to extend those for a year and re-tender for floating support but in a configuration yet to be determined. Re Handy Persons Services SP will need to do a market test or tender in order to develop a social enterprise model.</p> <p><u>Bob Porter</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current format of this group is working really well and allows for more frank discussions. It is a shame that there are not more representatives present.</li> </ul>	