

Appendix 1: Options Appraisal

Option	Benefits	Risks
<p>Option 1: Recommission the service in the same format</p> <p>Recommission the service with one prime provider with the provider spot purchasing through a variety of agency and freelance interpreters.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains stability within the provider market; • Retains consistency for Partners accessing the contract; • Manageable within the existing budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The back-office performance of the contract is poor; • Video interpreting has not been developed and exploited within the contract; • The current contract is not dynamic and is not using the budget efficiently; • The combination of services is now outdated; • There is a traditional methodology to the contract with inherent high costs; • Current issues with short notice and/or urgent bookings will continue.
<p>Option 2: Recommission the service through external providers with a Framework Contract.</p> <p>A framework agreement will be set up for provision of the whole service with KCC being the contracting authority using the framework agreement and responsible for awarding call-offs agreements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers a commercial advantage by giving access to a wide selection of service options and providers in one contract and increasing the supply chain; • Creates an environment with supports continuous improvement; • Better value with procurement costs and lower transaction costs, and no cost per bidding; • Opportunity to create more social value with greater community wealth and using the interpreters local to the Kent community; • Offers a commercial solution which embraces previous lessons learnt from other Framework agreements which are not bespoke for the geographical area; • Enables specific qualifications to be defined with the contract; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially lengthy governance process, requiring a key decision and that a contract could not be mobilised by April 2019 without a small contract extension; • Large agencies bid to be on the framework and local smaller freelancers are not equipped to deal with the procurement process; • Service does not have the opportunity to re-shape some of the core provision; • Opportunity lost to develop local interpreters and shape the trainees with the local pool of interpreters.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives the freedom to award a contract without the need to re-advertising; • Enables a contract to be flexibly with the skills need for the service Lots; • Creates a continuous improvement opportunity with long term relationships between suppliers/providers, people in receipt of the service and other stakeholders; • Practitioners could identify the interpreter and service they want easily; • The framework gives the ability to continuously work with the community. 	
<p>Option 3: Commissioning Interpreting Services through a national framework</p> <p>The current contract to cease with KCC becoming a partner organisation and commissioning the whole provision through one of the national framework agreements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Save on future and current commissioning and re-tendering costs; • Benefit from a framework agreement which has been in place and operating efficiently across the UK; • Access video conference interpreting immediately; • Choice of a framework which has many Lots to suit the local need. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National frameworks do not guarantee the provision of qualified interpreters; • The NUBSI research details the use of this type of framework directly leads to a poor service to users which in turn increases the demand on social services e.g. poor interpreting can mean people do not understand the issue and the person will repeatedly need support from health and social care providers; • Local knowledge indicates registered and qualified interpreters will not register with foreign language agencies for work as the reputation of these agencies is very poor; • The use of foreign language agencies with little specialist knowledge will predominantly be active on the contract and unable to deliver a provision with qualified interpreters; • Local interpreters may not have access to the framework;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel costs may increase as local interpreters may not be used; • The use of framework agreements can mean a lack of choice with interpreters and limited to what is on offer within the framework; • The financial viability of the agencies within the framework cannot be assessed; • The national frameworks may not be re-commissioned after April 2019.
<p>Option 4: Establish an entire In-House Service</p> <p>This option is based on having an entirely in-house based service for the primary BSL interpreting function of the service for the core hours Monday to Friday. The service would cease commissioning all BSL interpreting requirements externally during the main operational hours of Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm. This option requires the need for a coordinator role to be established, and a minimum of 5 BSL Interpreter roles (part-time basis). An administrator may need to be employed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design work could be completed to define how many in-house interpreters would be needed to cover core work in the day; the design work may need to scope out the hours for the interpreters; • Opportunity to have highly skilled workers covering main caseloads in the day; • Interpreters would understand the culture of the organisation and be navigate support through the organisation more efficiently; • This is an opportunity to navigate high priority work more efficiently e.g. the right work is prioritised; • Opportunity to create an efficiency in how the administration charges are used within the service; • An improved service for deafblind, multiply impaired individuals and those with learning disabilities; • The ability to offer more stability and efficiency, timetable support for people; • Travel time significantly decreases; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not be financially viable; • Partners may not wish to engage with an entirely KCC in-house provision; • People in need of the service may develop a dependency on individual interpreters; • May not be able to match of a freelance salary with a full time/part time contract; • Insufficient work for interpreters; • No provision to cover out of hours assignments; • Back office staff would need to be Level 2 qualified to have detailed understanding of role, therefore, these roles would recruited at a higher cost.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum booking slots reduce; • Back office staff will be experienced interpreter and could deliver the service at a higher quality; • KCC would have full control to implement the necessary changes. 	
<p>Option 5: Hybrid Model (combination of in-house interpreters and a framework agreement)</p> <p>The provision requires a combination of a small in-house service of 3 part-time interpreters for core work (Monday to Friday), together with a framework agreement to deliver any deficit in the core and the out of hours provision. This provision allows for growth in the in-house service to continually address the core demands of the service; in addition to supporting the development of specialist interpreters working towards the outcomes the KCC market.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The combined benefits of both Option 2 and 4 would support the option; • The full scope of the Lots would be supported; • A truly tailored service may be developed with an increased understanding of local d/Deaf and deafblind culture; • An opportunity to design, develop and implement the use of Video Interpreting and investigate the range of soft and hardware available for use with this type of service; • An opportunity to employ deaf workers as Purchasing Co-ordinators; • The Access to Work interpreters supporting Purchasing Officers may be used to support the service; • An out of hours tailored provision may be developed; • Responsive service for priority cases during core hours • A flexible service which can grow and shape to the demands of the service; • The framework risks of non-core hour coverage detailed in Option 2 would be mitigated by the core hour in-house interpreter coverage; • Reduction in Contract Management resource; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The in-house element of the service would need a development period of 6 – 12 months to ensure the service grows with the level of need and flexes with the changes in provision; • There is a deficit of hours which can be covered by the three part time interpreters initially employed; • Potentially lengthy governance process, requiring a key decision and that a contract could not be mobilised by April 2019 without a small contract extension; • Large agencies bid to be on the framework and local smaller freelancers are not equipped to deal with the procurement process; • The interpreters may experience ‘burn out’ with the high level of pre-booked work.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The combined Risks of Options 3 and 4 would be mitigated. 	
<p>Option 6: Block Contract</p> <p>Commission a block contract of contracted hours through one prime provider.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget is fixed and will not fluctuate; • Prime provider may become specialist with local provision and able to deliver a flexible service within the block provision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The model is volatile with hours not flexible to meet the needs of the provision; • Block contracts is out dated and no longer a provision which can meet the needs of the complex nature of the provision; • The service will increase over time and a block contract would be quite limited; • This option will not allow for a range of payments and flexibility of delivery of service. •