



## Cabinet

**Monday 16 June 2014 at 7.00 pm**

Boardroom - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,  
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

### Membership:

#### Lead Member Councillors:

#### Portfolio

Butt (Chair)	Leader of the Council
Pavey (Vice-Chair)	Deputy Leader of the Council
Denselow	Lead Member for Stronger Communities
Hirani	Lead Member for Adults, Health and Well-being
Mashari	Lead Member for Employment and Skills
McLennan	Lead Member for Regeneration and Housing
R Moher	Lead Member for Children and Young People
Perrin	Lead Member for Environment

**For further information contact:** Anne Reid, Principal Democratic Services Officer  
020 8937 1359, [anne.reid@brent.gov.uk](mailto:anne.reid@brent.gov.uk)

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:

**[democracy.brent.gov.uk](http://democracy.brent.gov.uk)**

**The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting**

# Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence.

**Item** **Page**

**1 Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting, any relevant financial or other interest in the items on this agenda.

**2 Minutes of the previous meeting** 1 - 10

**3 Matters arising (if any)**

**Adult and Social Care reports**

**4 Adult Home Care Services - framework appointments** 11 - 58

This report requests authority to appoint service providers to a Brent-led Framework for Home Support as required by Contract Standing Order 88. This report summarises the process undertaken in tendering this Framework and following the completion of the evaluation of the tenders, recommends providers to be appointed onto the Framework.  
*(Appendix also referred to below)*

**Ward Affected:**  
All Wards

**Lead Member:** Councillor Hirani  
**Contact Officer:** Phil Porter, Strategic Director,  
Adult Social Services  
Tel: 020 8937 5937 phil.porter@brent.gov.uk

**5 Advocacy Services - Learning Disabilities, Safeguarding, Mental Health and Older People and Young People with Physical Disabilities** 59 - 74

In accordance with Contract Standing Orders 88 this report seeks Cabinet authority to award a 2 + 1 year contract for Advocacy Services for Safeguarding, Mental Health, Learning Disabilities, Older People with Physical Disabilities and Younger People with Physical Disabilities. The report summarises the process undertaken in tendering this contract and following completion of the evaluation of the tender, recommends to whom the contract should be awarded.

**Ward Affected:**  
All Wards

**Lead Member:** Councillor Hirani  
**Contact Officer:** Amy Jones, Commissioning  
and Quality  
amy.jones@brent.gov.uk

## Environment and Neighbourhood Services reports

### 6 Safer Lorry Scheme 75 - 80

Brent Council has a long and successful track record of reducing accidents in Brent's roads. Recent analysis has shown that HGVs are involved in a significant proportion of cyclist and pedestrian accidents and this report seeks approval to implement a London wide, minimum standard of safety features on all HGVs over 3.5 tonnes.

**Ward Affected:**  
All Wards

**Lead Member:** Councillor Perrin  
**Contact Officer:** Jenny Isaac, Operational  
Director, Neighbourhood Services  
Tel: 020 8937 5001 [jenny.isaac@brent.gov.uk](mailto:jenny.isaac@brent.gov.uk)

## Regeneration and Growth reports

### 7 Leasing of Office Accommodation Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ 81 - 92

Following twelve months occupation to review the utilisation of space within the Civic Centre and, if appropriate, to approve leasing of office accommodation at Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley.  
*(Appendix also referred to below)*

**Ward Affected:**  
Tokyngton

**Lead Member:** Councillor McLennan  
**Contact Officer:** James Young, Property and  
Asset Management  
Tel: 020 8937 1398 [james.young@brent.gov.uk](mailto:james.young@brent.gov.uk)

### 8 Expansion of Woodfield SEN School 93 - 98

This report describes to members current proposals on the delivery of the agreed expansion of places at Woodfield Special Educational Needs (SEN) School. The proposal is to re-use modular units that previously formed part of the temporary school provision for The Village School, which are now redundant following the opening of the new Village School. The report then requests Cabinet approval for the contract variation proposed.

**Ward Affected:**  
Fryent

**Lead Member:** Councillor McLennan  
**Contact Officer:** Richard Barrett, Property and  
Asset Management  
Tel: 020 8937 1334 [richard.barrett@brent.gov.uk](mailto:richard.barrett@brent.gov.uk)

**9 Retendering of the Borough's Rough Sleepers' Outreach and Housing Advice and Resettlement Services** 99 - 136

This report provides an overview of the current trend towards an increase in the numbers of those sleeping rough in the borough, illustrating the clear need to maintain the current level of resourcing for rough sleeping services for the foreseeable future, but identifying, in light of the Homeless Link Needs Analysis, the desirability of remodelling the structure of these services to sharpen focus and so improve quality.

The report requests approval to invite tenders as required by Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89 in respect of a contract for Rough Sleepers Outreach Services and a contract for Rough Sleepers Housing Advice and Resettlement Services.

**Ward Affected:** All Wards  
**Lead Member:** Councillor McLennan  
**Contact Officer:** Laurence Coaker, Housing Needs Service  
Tel: 020 8937 2788  
laurence.coaker@brent.gov.uk

**10 Disposal of loft space at 96 Leighton Gardens, London NW10 3PU** 137 - 144

This report seeks approval to proceed with the disposal of the Council's loft space within the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) at 96 Leighton Gardens, London NW10 3PU for a capital receipt.  
*(Appendix also referred to below)*

**Ward Affected:** Brondesbury Park  
**Lead Member:** Councillor McLennan  
**Contact Officer:** Denish Patel, Property and Projects  
Tel: 020 8937 2529 denish.patel@brent.gov.uk

### Central Reports

**11 Brent Education Commission Review** 145 - 146

The Council commissioned a review of education in Brent to see how progress and performance might be accelerated for children and young people in schools. This review was chaired by the interim chief executive of Brent Council working with three other independent members. The report of the Commission is attached for consideration by the Cabinet.  
*(Appendix circulated separately)*

**Ward Affected:** All Wards  
**Lead Member:** Councillor Moher  
**Contact Officer:** Christine Gilbert, Interim Chief Executive  
Tel: 020 8937 1007  
christine.gilbert@brent.gov.uk

## 12 Internal Audit Options April 2015 onwards

147 -  
158

This report concerns the provision of outsourced internal audit services from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. This report requests approval to invite tenders in respect of internal audit services as required by Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89.

*(Appendix also referred to below)*

**Ward Affected:**

All Wards

**Lead Member:** Councillor Pavey

**Contact Officer:** Simon Lane, Audit and Investigations

Tel: 020 8937 1260 [simon.lane@brent.gov.uk](mailto:simon.lane@brent.gov.uk)

## 13 Appointments and nominations to outside bodies

### Appointment to Outside Bodies

#### Cabinet sub-committees

- Highways Committee
- Barham Park Committee

#### London-wide committees:

- London Housing Consortium

Two elected members to the Joint Committee; one cabinet and one non-cabinet member.

- Associated Joint Committee (London Councils Grants Committee)

One voting member, and up to four named deputies, who must all be a member of the nominating borough's cabinet.

### Children and Young People reports - none

## 14 Any other urgent business

Notice of items to be raised under this heading must be given in writing to the Democratic Services Manager or his representative before the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 64.

## 15 Exclusion of Press and Public

The following items are not for publication as they relate to the following category of exempt information as specified in the Local Government Act 1972 namely:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)".

### APPENDICES:

- Adult Home Care Services - framework appointments
  - Leasing of Office Accommodation Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ
  - Disposal of loft space at 96 Leighton Gardens, London NW10 3PU
  - Internal Audit Options April 2015 onwards
- (Reports above relate)*

**Date of the next meeting:            Monday 21 July 2014**



- Please remember to **SWITCH OFF** your mobile phone during the meeting.
- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public on a first come, first served basis.



## LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

### MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE Tuesday 22 April 2014 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Butt (Chair), Councillor R Moher (Vice-Chair) and Councillors A Choudry, Denselow, Hirani, Mashari, McLennan, J Moher and Pavey

Also present: Councillors Cheese, S Choudhary, Cummins and Hashmi

Apologies for absence were received from: Councillor Crane

#### 1. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

Councillor Butt declared personal interests in the item relating Copland Community School development as he has children attending the school and also in the item relating to National Non Domestic Rates – applications for Discretionary Rate Relief, as a former trustee of the Islamic Cultural Centre.

#### 2. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 24 March 2014 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

#### 3. **Matters arising**

None.

#### 4. **Event Day parking and vehicle removals**

Councillor J Moher (Lead Member, Highways and Transportation) introduced the report which responded to concerns over the council's practise in respect of the removal to the car pound of illegally parked vehicles one Wembley Stadium Event Days. It was felt that this resulted in the unnecessary removal of a number of vehicles when a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) would suffice. The report from the Strategic Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods proposed a pilot in which removals would not take place for less serious parking offences whilst impacts on compliance were monitored to inform a longer term policy on removals. Additionally, the report referred to concerns that the council's existing enforcement of the controls within the Wembley Stadium Protective Parking Zone (Event Day Zone) started too early in the day which unnecessarily inconvenienced residents.

Members welcomed the proposals to review the current practices and the opportunity to look after residents' interests. Councillor Butt (Leader of the Council) cautioned that a robust approach would be taken on any abuse.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the analysis of vehicle removals in Brent in comparison to other London Boroughs set out in paragraphs 3.5 to 3.10 and the financial implications in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.8 of the report from the Strategic Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods be noted;
- (ii) that agreement be given to a pilot of an alternative policy regarding the removal of illegally parked vehicles for a period from 1 May 2014 up to the end of October 2014 as described in paragraphs 3.12 to 3.16 and Appendix A to the report;
- (iii) that authority be delegated to the Operational Director, Environment and Protection to amend the policy and arrangements being piloted through the life of the pilot in consultation with the Lead Member for Highways and Transportation;
- (iv) that officers bring a report on the conclusions reached from the pilot regarding the removals of illegally parked vehicles to a future Highways Committee and Executive meeting;
- (v) that agreement be given to a trial of the revised arrangements for the start and finish times of Event Day enforcement described in paragraph 3.20 for the remainder of 2014 and that a further report be brought to the Highways Committee and Executive on the conclusions of the trial before the first Stadium Event of 2015.

## **5. Authority to tender for Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Services**

Councillor Choudry (Lead Member, Crime Prevention and Public Safety) introduced the report from the Strategic Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods which concerned the procurement of a domestic violence advocacy (IDVA service), family support and a multi-agency risk assessment conference (MARAC) coordination service. It sought authority to invite tenders for the IDVA and MARAC services as required by Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that approval be given to the invite of tenders to provide a domestic violence advocacy for women 16 years old and over and MARAC coordination service for all high risk victims;
- (ii) that approval be given to the pre-tender considerations and the proposed evaluation criteria set out in paragraph 5.1 of the report from the Strategic Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods.

## **6. Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service - approval to tender**



The Executive noted that the report from the Acting Director of Children and Families was an update to the report to the Executive of 9 December 2013 and concerned the procurement of the revised Child and Adolescent Mental Health services (CAMHS). It requested approval to invite tenders in respect of Child and Adolescent Mental Health services as required by Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89 and also authority to delegate award of the contract to the Strategic Director of Children and Young People in consultation with the Director of Legal and Procurement and the Chief Finance Officer.

Councillor Pavey (Lead Member, Children and Families) stated that since the meeting in December 2013 when the CAMHS service had been discussed, consultation had been carried out, the outcome of which had been taken on board. The Director of Legal and Procurement confirmed that the procurement process had to be truncated in order to have a service in place by the end of the existing contract and members sought assurances that service quality would not be jeopardised as a result. The Acting Director of Children and Families assured that work was already taking place to ensure a smooth transition.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that approval be given to the invite tenders for a Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service on the basis of those pre-tender considerations set out in paragraph 3.4 of the report from the Acting Director of Children and Families;
- (ii) that officers evaluate the tenders referred to in paragraph (i) above on the basis of the evaluation criteria set out in paragraph 3.4 (vi) of the report from the Acting Director of Children and Families;
- (iii) that the intention to tender for a contract for a term of two years with the option for the Council to extend for an additional year be noted;
- (iv) that authority be delegated to award the contract for a Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service to the Strategic Director of Children and Young People in consultation with the Director of Legal and Procurement and Chief Finance Officer for the reasons detailed in paragraph of the report.

## **7. Private Rented Sector - Licensing**

Councillor McLennan (Lead Member, Housing) introduced the report which sought approval for the introduction of an Additional Licensing scheme in the whole area of Brent and to defer a decision on introducing Selective Licensing in Brent to the next available meeting following a further two month consultation on which wards should be covered.

Councillor McLennan reminded the Executive that the Private Rented Sector now constituted a third of the housing in Brent and played a very important role in meeting the housing requirements of residents. Licensing would help address problems associated with parts of the sector arising from poor management, property conditions and related problems of anti-social behaviour. The initiative had been introduced in other boroughs and would help cover costs and the changes

would be introduced in November/December 2014. Wards affected would be carefully selected.

The Strategic Director, Regeneration and Growth drew attention to the extensive consultation that had been carried out with a significant number of responses from private landlords, private tenants, other residents and businesses. Following consideration of these it was proposed to proceed with the introduction of Additional Licensing which would cover all houses in multiple occupation in the borough.

Members welcomed the initiative and the response from residents. Councillor Mashari hoped it would help bring about improvements in areas such as fly-tipping.

In response to concerns expressed by non-Executive member Councillor Cummins that the changes would adversely affect those landlords who managed their properties well, costs would be passed on to tenants and rents increase, it was put that the need to ensure that tenants were protected and able to have decent living standards was paramount. It was explained that any increase in rent would be negligible as landlords would not be able to pass on disproportionate increases and could reclaim expenses. Councillor McLennan assured that the council would be working with the lettings agency and landlords would be supported.

#### RESOLVED:

- (i) that the evidence and the responses to consultation on Additional and Selective Licensing set out in the report from the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth be noted and the proposed schemes introduced;
- (ii) that subject to (i) above, agreement be given that the legal requirements for introducing additional licensing for the whole area of the borough of Brent as set out in paragraphs 11.1 to 11.6 of the report, have been met;
- (iii) that subject to (i) and (ii) above, the designation of an Additional Licensing area to cover the whole borough of Brent, as delineated and edged red on the map at Appendix 3 of the report be authorised to take effect from 1 January 2015 and to last for five years from that date;
- (iv) that that the council will begin to accept applications for Additional Licensing from 1<sup>st</sup> November 2014, in anticipation of the scheme coming into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2015;
- (v) that authority to issue the required statutory notifications in relation to the Additional Licensing Scheme designation be delegated to the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth;
- (vi) that the decision to proceed with Selective Licensing in Wembley Central, Harlesden and Willesden Green be deferred to a future Executive meeting and before then, proceed with:
  - Further consultation over a two month period on whether other wards, namely Dudden Hill and Mapesbury, should be included in addition to Harlesden, Wembley Central and Willesden Green in the areas to be subject to a Selective Licensing scheme.

- Further analysis and consideration of the evidence relating to additional wards.
- (vii) that the fees for Additional Licensing be set at £550 for the five-year licensing period;
- (viii) that, subject to further consultation, authority be delegated to the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth to agree the basis for and level of any discounts to be applied to these fees;
- (ix) that the Additional Licensing scheme be kept under review annually and that any significant changes, including the withdrawal of a licensing designation, be subject to further consultation and a decision by the Executive.

## **8. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulation 123 List**

The Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth advised that the council had adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule that applied a charge to most new development in the borough. The purpose of the CIL charge was to fund new infrastructure such as schools, parks, roads and public transport improvements required to support development and growth. The council was advised to produce a list of priorities (a Regulation 123 list) itemising those types of infrastructure it wishes to spend CIL on. The report from the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Growth set out a proposed CIL Regulation 123 List for the council to adopt.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that approval be given to publish the CIL Regulation 123 List as set out in Appendix 1 of the report from the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth, advertise the Regulation 123 List on the council's website and consider any representations arising;
- (ii) that authority to make, consult and publish changes to the Regulation 123 List be delegated to the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth in consultation with the Lead Member for Regeneration.

## **9. Deputation - Copland Community School and adjacent lands**

With the consent of the Executive, Jean Roberts representing teachers of Copland Community School and residents, addressed the meeting and spoke against proposals to expand the school on to adjacent land involving a land transfer. She referred to the terms of title deeds, covenants and Rights of Way which could prohibit the scheme and also the intention to grant a 125 year lease on the final school site to ARK Schools (ARK) to whom the school was due to transfer as a sponsored academy on 1 September 2014. Seamus Sheridan also addressed the meeting and expressed concern over the lack of proper consultation over the proposals and restrictions on speaking rights at a public meeting. He stated that children and residents were against the expansion proposals which would result in a loss of land used for play.

10. **Copland Community School and adjacent lands - proposed land rationalisation and update on Academy conversion and Priority Schools Building Programme**

The report from the Acting Director of Children and Families explained that Copland Community School (CCS), which was currently a foundation school, was scheduled to become a sponsored Academy on 1 September 2014. The school would transfer to ARK Schools (ARK) to operate from a new building anticipated to be completed by September 2016 and at that point the school would expand by an addition one form entry. The report before members proposed arrangements to rationalise land ownership, ensure an optimum footprint for the new school buildings, and support the wider regeneration of the area in line with the Wembley Area Action Plan.

The Executive also had before them an appendix to the report which was not for publication as it contained the following category of exempt information as specified in Schedule 12 of the Local Government (Access to Information Act) 1972:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

Councillor Pavey (Lead Member, Children and Families) spoke in support of the development proposals and the opportunity to help improve the school which had been through challenging times in the recent past. He acknowledged the concerns raised earlier in the meeting but stated that council would work in partnership with the school's Interim Executive Board and thereafter with ARK for the benefit of the local community and look forward for brighter future.

The Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth reminded the Executive that the report related to land rationalisation and site ownership and also involved the expansion of the nearby Elsley Primary School. Through leasing the land the freehold would be safeguarded. Funds were required to support the rebuild, provide furniture and fittings and also off site improvements. The style of the frontage would be in accordance with the action plan. The council would make the necessary statutory application for the restrictions on the title of the school to be lifted and he drew members' attention to the information in the appendix to the report which was not for publication. The Director of Legal and Procurement assured that legal advice would continue to be taken and the Chief Finance Officer added that while it was too early to quantify costs precisely, the council's interests would be protected.

Members of the Executive spoke in support of the proposals to redevelop the school referring to the importance of teachers playing a positive role, the desire for the school to prosper for the benefit of the children. It was felt the proposals would help address shortage of school places, affordable housing and was an opportunity to regenerate the high road. Views were expressed that members had the responsibility to make difficult decisions and a new school building for Copland Community School was a priority and long overdue. Further consultation would take place as part of the planning process.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that it be noted that Copland Community School has been approved by the Secretary of State for Education for conversion to an Academy with the ARK as a sponsor;
- (ii) that it be noted that Copland Community School was proposed for rebuilding under the Priority Schools Building Programme and that the Education Funding Authority will be responsible for delivery of the new school;
- (iii) that approval be given to assist Copland Community School's Interim Executive Board with removal of the title restriction;
- (iv) that the Council enter into a deed of indemnity with Copland Community School 's Interim EB as further explained in Section 6 of the report and the confidential appendix 1;
- (v) that agreement be given to the land transfers as outlined in the report and for the Council to seek appropriate approvals from Copland Community School's Interim Executive Board, the Secretary of State and The Ark Academy as required;
- (vi) that the Council underwrite costs arising from the build of the new school including provision of Furniture Fittings and Equipment and ICT as well as other associated costs together with transitional liabilities of the current school as set out in the confidential appendix 1;
- (vii) that officers work with Copland Community School's Interim Executive Board, the Ark Academy, the Education Funding Agency (in relation to both conversion issues and the Priority Schools Building Programme) and Secretary of State for Education and Sport England to secure appropriate agreements and consents;
- (viii) that authority be delegated to the Operational Director of Regeneration and Growth (Policy and Projects) in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and the Operational Director of Children and Families to agree the scope and detailed terms of the land rationalisation proposals outlined in this report.

#### **11. Deputation - disposal of land at Drury Way, Neasden**

James Huckerby (Pickfords) addressed the meeting in connection with the report from the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Growth concerning proposals for the disposal of the freehold of land within the council's ownership at Drury Lane, Neasden and their bid for the site. He outlined and the opportunities that could be presented to the borough should their bid be successful.

#### **12. Disposal of open parking land at Drury Way, St Raphael's, Neasden**

The report from the Director of Regeneration and Growth set out proposals for the disposal of the freehold of land within the council's ownership at Drury Lane, Neasden.

The Executive also had before them an appendix to the report which was not for publication as it contained the following category of exempt information as specified in Schedule 12 of the Local Government (Access to Information Act) 1972:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The Director in introducing the report advised that at this stage the preferred bidder was Wallace School of Transport which was Brent based. The Director of Legal and Procurement outlined the bidding process and referred members to the appendix to the report, which was not for publication, which set out the commercial aspects and the Chief Finance Officer concurred that 'best value' had been the key consideration.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that approve be given to the disposal the freehold interest in the land at Drury Way, Neasden, as marked on the attached plan, on a subject to survey basis to the Wallace School of Transport Ltd for a capital receipt upon the grant of planning consent;
- (ii) that, as a reserve, subject to satisfactory resolution of matters highlighted in the confidential appendix B of the report from the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth, in the event that the above offer does not proceed satisfactorily that the alternative two offers as set out in the confidential appendix B paragraph 15 also be approved;
- (iii) that the Operational Director Property and Projects be authorised to agree the terms of the transaction in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer.

### 13. **South Kilburn Regeneration Programme**

The report from the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Growth sought approval to delegate authority to the Operational Director of Property and Projects to grant a Lease for land anticipated to comprise the transformer chamber at Bronte House and Fielding House, Cambridge Road, Kilburn, London NW6 5BG to UK Power Networks Plc.

RESOLVED:

that authority be delegated to the Operational Director of Property and Projects to grant a Lease and ancillary consents related to the grant of a Lease to UK Power Networks Plc for land anticipated to comprise the transformer chamber at Bronte & Fielding House, Cambridge Road, Kilburn, London NW6 5BG as identified on the plan at Appendix 1 of the Director's report.

### 14. **161 High Street (Job Centre Plus) Harlesden**

Andrew Donald (Strategic Director, Regeneration and Growth) introduced his report which set out proposals for the taking of a lease at 161 High Street, Harlesden for a period up to 31 August 2015 in order to allow for the continued operation of the Brent Customer Services Centre that was currently in occupation.

RESOLVED:

that the Council enter into a lease with Department of Work and Pensions for a sub lease of premises at 161 High Street, Harlesden for a period up to 31 August 2015.

**15. NNDR Applications for Discretionary Rate Relief**

The Council has the discretion to award rate relief to charities or non-profit making bodies. It also had the discretion to remit an individual National Non-Domestic Rate (NNDR) liability in whole or in part on the grounds of hardship. The award of relief was based on policy and criteria agreed by the Executive in September 2013. The report from the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Growth detailed new applications for rate relief received since the Executive last considered such applications on 14 January 2014.

Members noted that the council's eligibility criteria would be amended to reflect a change in legislation whereby organisations were now required to submit certified and not fully audited accounts.

RESOLVED:

that the applications for discretionary rate relief detailed in Appendices 2 and 3 of the report from the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth be agreed.

**16. Renewal of Microsoft Licensing Agreement**

Councillor R Moher introduced the report from the Chief Finance Officer which requested authority to award contracts as required by Contract Standing Order No 88. The report summarised the process undertaken in selecting a supplier and, following the completion of the evaluation of the bids, recommended to whom the contract should be awarded.

The Executive also had before them an appendix to the report which was not for publication as it contained the following category of exempt information as specified in Schedule 12 of the Local Government (Access to Information Act) 1972:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

RESOLVED:

that approval be given to the award of the contract for Microsoft Licences for a period of three years to Bytes Software Services.

**17. Reference of item considered by Call in Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

None.

**18. Any other urgent business**

None.


19. **Vote of Thanks**

As this was the last meeting of the Executive prior to the Local Elections scheduled for 22 May 2014, on behalf of the Executive, Councillor J Moher thanked officers for the tremendous support they had given to the Administration over the past four years, through what had often been, challenging times. He also thanked members of the public for their continued interest.

The meeting ended at 8.25 pm

M BUTT  
Chair



 <b>Brent</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Cabinet</b> 16 June 2014</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Report from the Strategic Director of Adult Social Care</b></p>
<p>For Action <span style="float: right;">Wards affected: ALL</span></p>	
<p><b>Authority to Award a multi lot Framework Agreement for Home Support Services</b></p>	

Appendix 3 of this report is “Not for Publication”.

## 1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report requests authority to appoint service providers to a Brent-led Framework for Home Support as required by Contract Standing Order 88. This report summarises the process undertaken in tendering this Framework and following the completion of the evaluation of the tenders, recommends providers to be appointed onto the Framework.
- 1.2 This new framework replaces the current framework which expires in September 2014.
- 1.3 The basic principles of how we commission homecare and manage this market have not changed fundamentally. However, the new framework will bring greater sustainability and capacity to the market in Brent. It also begins to tackle the underlying challenges in the home care market of fair pay for the workforce through ensuring key issues such as travel time are factored into rates of pay. It also maintains a strong focus on value for money, and gives the council the flexibility to address a range of other issues such as London Living Wage in the future through mini-competitions, whilst bringing a stronger focus on the quality of services and how we assure this.

## 2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Cabinet approves the appointment to the West London Alliance Framework to provide Home Support of those providers listed in Appendix 1 for a period of four (4) years.

2.2 That the Cabinet agrees to the award of Call-Off Contracts to all those providers listed in Appendix 1 to enable Brent to use these providers for its own home care needs

### 3.0 Detail

#### Background

3.1 On 18 June 2012 the Executive gave approval for Brent to lead a procurement process to create a multi-lot Framework on behalf of the West London Alliance group of boroughs, plus Southwark & Wandsworth and associated health partners, for the provision of Home Support Services.

3.2. The Framework was split into six lots and advertisements were placed in various publications and media locally and nationally in November 2012 to seek initial expressions of interest from care providers, which elicited 286 initial enquires.

3.3 Subsequently 148 expressions of interest in the form of Pre-Qualification Questionnaires (PQQ) were returned completed. Assessment of the PQQs involved a pass/fail stage and a scored stage. The scored stage included lot-specific questions. 97 of the PQQs passed the pass/fail stage and went through to the scoring stage.

3.4 In the scored section there was minimum threshold of 60% across the all questions within the PQQ. Furthermore the evaluation methodology stipulated that following the invitation to tender (ITT) stage the following number of providers would be appointed on to the Framework for each lot, following ranking by overall scores:

- Lot 1 = 40 bidders
- Lot 2 = 20 bidders
- Lot 3 = 40 bidders
- Lot 4 = 20 bidders
- Lot 5 = 20 bidders
- Lot 6 = 30 bidders

3.5 Fifty-six providers across all lots passed the PQQ scoring stage on the basis of the criteria above, however 41 failed. Detailed below is the number of providers that passed the scoring stage for each lot:

3.6.1 Lot 1 = 27

3.6.2 Lot 2 = 22

3.6.3 Lot 3 = 25

3.6.4 Lot 4 = 11

3.6.5 Lot 5 = 8

### 3.6.6 Lot 6 = 16

At this stage in the process the numbers of providers passing the PQQ stage were not sufficient, when compared with the numbers hoped to be appointed to the Framework (see paragraph 3.4).

- 3.6 In July 2013 the Adult Social Care WLA directors considered the situation and agreed to the carrying out of a procurement review, to include inviting the market to a provider event to offer feedback on the process.
- 3.7 In the meantime three participants, Southwark & Wandsworth and Hillingdon decided not to continue with the WLA procurement and opted to pursue a more localised procurement strategy.
- 3.8 Following on from the procurement review a further recommendation to continue with the existing procurement was considered and approved at the next WLA Directors meeting in October 2013. A decision was taken for the minimum score threshold used at PQQ stage to be consistent with other recent tenders undertaken by Brent Adult Social Care. This minimum score threshold requires providers to score at least 50% of the score available to pass the PQQ stage, as opposed to 60%.
- 3.9 Applying a threshold of 50% and also carrying out a due diligent clarification process of the PQQs previously submitted, resulted in 48 more providers passing the PQQ scoring stage and therefore increasing the number from 56 to 104 shortlisted to ITT providers. This number provided procurement assurance and alleviated some of the capacity concerns.

#### **The tender process**

- 3.10 All providers were informed of the outcome of the PQQ stage and the 104 bidders that were successful at PQQ stage were issued with the Invitation to Tender (ITT) documentation.
- 3.11 The Framework procurement documentation detailed that it would be created with the following Lots:
  - Lot 1 - Personal care and home support services for adults in the community.
  - Lot 2 - Extra care and supported housing domiciliary care and support services.
  - Lot 3 - Reablement services and therapeutic approaches.
  - Lot 4 - Children's services including transition services.
  - Lot 5 – Enhanced Home Based Care (formerly referred to as Community nursing and integrated health and social care home based care).
  - Lot 6 - Housing Related Support, generic services.
- 3.12 It should be noted that the project officers from all the participating Boroughs involved in the tender facilitated a provider event on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2014 prior

to the ITT submission to give guidance and support to tenderers on ensuring a good quality submission. This event was well attended.

3.13 It should also be noted that the opportunity was taken to revisit the target number of appointments for each lot of the framework. As an update to the information listed in paragraph 3.4 above, it was decided that the following should be notified to bidders as the desired number to appoint:

- Lot 1 = 60 bidders
- Lot 2 = 40 bidders
- Lot 3 = 40 bidders
- Lot 4 = 30 bidders
- Lot 5 = 20 bidders
- Lot 6 = 30 bidders

### **Tender Evaluation process**

3.14 A multi-borough evaluation panel consisting of 37 evaluators from Adult Social Services, Procurement, Finance and Service Users, across all participating boroughs was established to undertake the tender evaluation process. The evaluation process consisted of the following 3 stages:

- **Stage 1** - A preliminary compliance review to ensure all tenders received were compliant; this process entailed checking all submitted tenders to ensure all documents required to support the tender were submitted and the ITT submission was in accordance with our instructions to tender (i.e. all sections of the ITT submission were completed in full).
- **Stage 2** – Full evaluation of price submission and quality responses. On the quality responses, providers were required, (in accordance with the evaluation methodology), to pass all questions. Providers would fail if they score “0” in any of the scored questions and fail to achieve 20% (half of the 40% of allocated for the overall quality score to be considered eligible for progressing to the evaluation of pricing. Upon completion of the evaluation a moderation exercise was carried out and final scores agreed.
- **Stage 3** – Ranking of providers. The ranking stage combined the price and quality score for Bidders within each Lot and ranked them with the highest scoring Bidder in each Lot being given a ranking of 1.

### **Stage 1 Evaluation – Preliminary compliance**

3.15 Following stage one of the evaluation process two providers (referred to by their ITT IDs) failed stage 1, these were ITT 27 and ITT 49 and were therefore unable to proceed to stage 2 of the evaluation process

### **Stage 2 Evaluation – Quality element**

3.16 The ITT stated that the Framework Agreement would be awarded on the basis of the most economically advantageous offer based upon price and quality, with 60% of weighted marks allocated to price, and 40% against quality.

3.17 The quality evaluation process assessed provider's responses to method statement questions with the following criteria:

For all Lots the criteria are:

- Meeting the needs of the individual and customer focus,
- Approach to safeguarding, performance and safe environment,
- Approach to staff recruitment, retention and training,
- Mobility and capacity building,
- Business Continuity Planning,
- Information systems and their use for monitoring service provision,
- Approach to partnership working with the Council and others.

For detailed weightings per criteria per lot please see Appendix 2.

For Providers Quality scoring outcome per lot please see Appendix 1.

3.18 The specified minimum threshold for the quality score was 20% (half of the 40% of mark allocated to quality). Six providers failed stage 2 on that basis:

- ITT 01 10.25%
- ITT 22 16.42%.
- ITT 28 14.63%.
- ITT 31 17.17%.
- ITT 42 18.67%.
- ITT 46 16.50%.

(A list of all the providers and their ITT IDs is attached in the confidential Appendix 3).

### **Stage 2 Evaluation – Price element**

3.19 Providers were requested to provide hourly rates for each lot. For some lots tenderers were required to provide more than one rate dependant on the service type and provide a cost breakdown and assumptions underpinning their cost.

As detailed below:

Lot 1 - Personal care and home support services for adults in the community.

- Lot 1 Hourly Day Rate
- Lot 1 Live in 24 hours rate
- Lot 1 Sleeping Night 10 hours rate
- Lot 1 Waking Night 10 hours rate

Lot 2 - Extra care and supported housing(SH) domiciliary care and support services.

- Lot 2 Extra Care & SH Hourly Day Rate
- Lot 2 Extra Care & SH Live in 24 hours rate

Lot 3 - Reablement services and therapeutic approaches.

- Lot 3 Reablement Hourly Rate

Lot 4 - Children's services including transition services.

- Lot 4 Level 1
- Lot 4 Level 2
- Lot 4 Level 3
- Lot 4 Level 4

Lot 5 – Enhanced Home Based Care (formerly referred to as Community nursing and integrated health and social care home based care).

- Lot 5 Hourly Day Rate
- Lot 5 Live in 24 hours rate
- Lot 5 Sleeping Night 10 hours rate
- Lot 5 Waking Night 10 hours rate

Lot 6 - Housing Related Support, generic services.

- Lot 6 Hourly Rate

3.20 The rates submitted by each Provider were entered into a price evaluation matrix; the calculation was in accordance with the following method:

(Lowest price ÷ Bidders price) x Price weighting (60%).

This means that the lowest priced bidder scored 60% while the others got a score proportionally derived from this.

3.21 Bidders were required to submit a price to cover 4 years, fixed for the life of the framework with no provision for an automatic inflationary uplift during that time. If a bidder attempted to purposely come in at a low rate (known as loss leader) the WLA Evaluation Panel – “EP” had the right to reject on the basis of an abnormally low rate, which is not considered sustainable for the life of the framework. To ensure fair assessment supporting this right the EP followed the below process:

- Examined assumptions stated within the pricing schedules
- which were then considered in conjunction with the details of the submission of method statement 4.1 – the tenders supporting statement underpinning their pricing
- followed by detailed clarifications

Following this process no tenderers were excluded.

3.22 It was made clear to bidders that the Framework terms and conditions do not include an automatic right to an increase in the hourly rate; it is discretionary in circumstances of hardship only. This was the approach adopted by the WLA at high-level discussions.

3.23 It should be noted that the approach of a 4 year fixed price bid was taken forward in conjunction with an emphasis to the providers of (a) the need for a

sustainable offer and (b) ensuring consideration of various assumptions underpinning their cost breakdown including compliance with any upcoming legislation like national minimum wage, changes to pension requirements etc.

- 3.24 There was no mandatory requirement for prices to be submitted on the basis of all providers having to pay the London Living Wage "LLW" to their staff. A significant number of providers did however include LLW pay scales in their submitted rates i.e. they have already decided to pay all their staff at LLW levels. As LLW was not mandatory, any borough wanting to take the position that all provider staff must be paid the LLW will have to do a further competition from the Framework, i.e. LLW is one of the triggers for carrying out mini competition. However, bidders were required to demonstrate that the hourly rate incorporated, travel time, training, sickness and annual leave. This is in line with objectives set out in the Unison Ethical care Charter and United Kingdom Homecare Association Ltd (UKHCA).

For Providers Pricing scoring outcome per lot please see Appendix 1.

- 3.25 Fifty-one providers passed the requirements of stage 1 and 2 (mainly for more than one lot) and proceeded to stage 3 of the ITT process, ranking.

### **Stage 3 of the Evaluation – Ranking stage**

- 3.26 The ranking stage combined total score of the price and quality score for Bidders within each Lot and ranked them with the highest scoring Bidder in each Lot being given a ranking of 1. The ranking for all Lots is presented in Appendix 1.

### **Conclusion**

- 3.27 Having completed the evaluation, officers recommend the providers listed in Appendix 1 to be appointed to the West London Alliance Framework for Home Support Services. In Appendix 1 there are tables showing ranking lists based on combined scoring (quality and price) per lot per service type.

### **Next Steps**

- 3.28 Following the Cabinet decision and expiry of call-in period, Brent as lead borough will need to issue framework agreements to each provider appointed, setting out terms and conditions and including the specification for each lot for which they are appointed.
- 3.29 Each borough, including Brent, then needs to enter into its own Call-Off Contract with each Framework provider that it wants to use. These include individual borough-specific requirements. Once a provider has a call-off contract with that borough, individual packages of care for service users can be placed. Brent is proposing to enter into Call-Off contracts with every provider being appointed to the Framework, and accordingly authority is requested for this in recommendation 2.2.

- 3.30 This two-stage process should mean that the Framework is available for use by the 30<sup>th</sup> September 2014 when the current WLA Framework Agreement comes to an end.

#### 4.0 Financial Implications

- 4.1 The framework agreement has no set agreed service levels or spend guarantee attached to it, which allowed for smaller micro organisations and the voluntary sector to take part in the tender exercise within each borough. This approach will also allow each borough to manage budgets accordingly.

The estimate value attached to this framework agreement, across all possible parties calling off this framework, is as per the below table.

Description	Estimated Value
Adult's Home Support	£60.0m
Children's Home Support	£1.8m
Extra Care	£6.0m
Total per annum	£67.8m
Additional avenues which could be included:	
Housing Support	£55.5m
Health (per body)	£1.5m
Other local authorities – potential of 3	£37.2m
Total additional avenues per annum	£94.2m
Overarching total per annum	£162.0m
Total estimated value over 4 years	£648.0m

- 4.2 The contract has specified a fixed price with no clause for inflationary increase for the life of the contract. This clause gives the council price stability for the life of the contract, allowing for inflationary increase to be removed from the Medium Term Financial Strategy for Home base support.
- 4.3 This framework includes options to call off 16 different services across 6 Lots using up to 51 providers. There are also a number of other variables in the framework that make estimating the potential cost of the provision challenging. These variables are:
- a) The providers have tendered prices that vary significantly; each provider has tendered a different price for each type of service they provide across the 6 lots.
  - b) Each provider has differing capacity on the volume of hours of care they can provide and these have not been identified as part of the tendering process. To compound this, there will be a number of member WLA boroughs calling off on this contract, impacting on individual provider capacity.
  - d) The geographical location of the provider in relation to the calling off Borough.



4.4 Due to the large disparity of prices per service, the providers have been grouped on the basis of their tender price to estimate the range of possible costs resulting in the utilisation of this contract:

Group 1: Using only the top third providers with the highest price

Group 2: Using only the middle third providers based on price

Group 3: Using only the bottom third providers with the lowest prices

Lots	13/14 Commissioned Cost £'000's	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Mean Average	
		Forecast Spend £'000's	Variance £'000's	Forecast Spend £'000's	Variance £'000's	Forecast Spend £'000's	Variance £'000's	Forecast Spend £'000's	Variance £'000's
<b>Lot 1</b>									
Hourly Day	10,208	11,757	1,549	10,636	428	9,942	-266	10,760	552
Live in 24 Hours	46	63	17	35	-10	22	-24	40	-5
Sleeping Night	78	94	15	70	-9	47	-32	70	-8
Waking Night	52	49	-3	43	-9	33	-19	42	-10
<b>Lot 2</b>									
Extra care SH	1,327	1,573	246	1,330	3	1,210	-117	1,370	43
<b>Lot 3</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reablement	831	1,091	260	899	68	819	-12	936	105
<b>Lot 4</b>									
Childrens	337	416	79	341	4	317	-20	355	18
<b>Lot 5</b>									
Hourly Day	971	1,257	285	1,110	139	1,019	48	1,119	148
Live in 24 Hour*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sleeping Night*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Waking Night*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Lot 6*</b>									
Hourly Day*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,850</b>	<b>16,300</b>	<b>2,450</b>	<b>14,464</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>13,408</b>	<b>-442</b>	<b>14,692</b>	<b>842</b>
<b>Percentage Variance</b>			17.69%		4.44%		-3.19%		6.08%

\*-Brent is unlikely to call off on these service types under these lots due to separate contracts already in place

4.5 The 2014/15 combined budget for Home Support is £14,376,000. The cost estimation have been based on the assumption that volumes of hours used will be static to enable a comparison solely based on price.

4.6 The Council has approved price led growth of £526,000 for Home based support as part of the 2014/15 budget setting process, after officers indicated the risk of a price increase in relation to this contract.

- 4.7 The above table identifies the potential additional cost of the contract which would be in the order of £842,000, if all the providers were used equally in relation to the number of hours of care called off from the contract. However, this is unlikely due to the variability in the contract mentioned in paragraph 4.3.
- 4.8 The table also shows that the potential annual cost of the contract is highly dependent on the usage of providers on the framework. In the event that the top third most expensive providers were used, the potential additional cost would be £2,450,000 per annum. Compared to a saving of £442,000 per annum, if the third most low-cost providers were used. This presents an issue of cost uncertainty for the council.
- 4.9 The scoring basis for this tender evaluation was based 60% on price and 40% on quality. Therefore, it can be expected that the low-priced providers would be ranked highest. Resulting in the council calling off provision from these providers first, and the higher priced providers only being utilised where capacity became limited with the low-priced providers.
- 4.10 Officers will seek to mitigate the cost uncertainty by carrying out mini tenders within the framework to take account of local needs. These new contracts could include types of contracts that would seek to achieve greater cost efficiencies through volume purchases.
- 4.11 In the event that capacity and usage of this contract led the forecasted spend to exceed the budget levels due to price, The Department would need to find additional unbudgeted savings within their service.
- 4.12 The department will monitor the spend related to the contract through the regular monthly budget and contract monitoring cycle. Any adverse projections will be addressed at the time to mitigate the risk of overspends.
- 4.13 In the event that these actions do not cover the potential additional costs the department would need to seek funding option through the Cabinet.

## **5.0 Legal Implications**

- 5.1 The local authority has a duty under s2 Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970, in conjunction with s29 National Assistance Act 1948 and Part III Children Act 1989, to 'make arrangements' for the provision of home care services to persons ordinarily resident in their area where they are satisfied that it is necessary to meet their needs. There is wide discretion within the legislative framework on what 'making arrangements' means but the Local Government Ombudsman [complaint no: 95/A4140] has ruled that a local authority must "be sure that is of suitable quality, meets the needs of the client, and offers value for money. It must be fair in its purchasing, not favouring one supplier against another for reasons unconnected with the quality of the service on offer."
- 5.2 The estimated value of the framework agreement over its lifetime makes it a High Value contract which is in excess of £250,000 and therefore the

procurement of and appointments to the framework are subject to the Council's Contract Standing Orders and Financial Regulations in respect of High Value Contracts. However, the procurement is of a service that is classed as a "part B" service under the European public procurement regime, so did not need to be tendered in accordance with those requirements; however there is still a duty under the relevant Regulations to act fairly and transparently to all bidders.

- 5.3 The procurement of the framework agreement is a collaborative procurement with other WLA authorities. Standing Order 85 details that any collaborative procurement should comply with the Council's Standing Orders and Financial Regulations. Brent led the procurement and therefore Brent's own Standing Orders and Financial Regulations applied to the procurement of the Framework.
- 5.4 Members should be aware that the decision to re-commence the PQQ process on the basis of a revised threshold quality score carries with it a very low risk of challenge from an organisation who might have submitted a PQQ but can make out that they did not do so because they were deterred by the original threshold score of 60%. However such a claim would not succeed because such an organisation would not be able to demonstrate any loss, as is required for a challenge under the EU Regulations governing public procurement.
- 5.5 In agreeing to the recommendations set out in this report, members need to be satisfied that making the recommended appointments represents the appointment of those tenderers who were most economically advantageous, in accordance with the published evaluation criteria (though in this case it should be noted that nearly all tenderers are recommended for appointment).

## **6.0 Diversity Implications**

- 6.1 Section 149 Equality Act 2010 requires the Council, when exercising its functions, to have "due regard" to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimization and other conduct prohibited under the Act, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who share a "protected characteristic" and those who do not share that protected characteristic. Failure to have due regard to this duty can render any decision unlawful.
- 6.2 The award of this new framework contract does not in itself create any diversity implications. A full EIA will be completed when transitions arrangements are being considered (changing from the current framework arrangements to the new framework) when there is greater clarity as to the packages of services that will be involved in the call off and/or mini competition from the new framework agreement to ensure that the duties set out in s149 Equalities Act 2010 are addressed. In addition to ensure there is no negative impact the call off contracts with the appointed to the framework providers will include:

### 6.2.1 Protection and enhancement of service and targeted provision for

protected groups

6.2.2 Quarterly contract monitoring and annual reviews for review requirements for protected groups

6.2.3 Annual user survey through the contract to identify the attitudes of protected groups and how they use the services.

## **7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)**

7.1 There are no TUPE implications arising from the award of the Framework Agreements. There may be TUPE implications from the award of call-off contracts under the Framework Agreements.

## **Background Papers**

**Executive Report 18th June 2012**

To obtain a copy of the full report please use the web-link below

<http://democracy.brent.gov.uk/documents/s8567/asc-home%20support%20V8.pdf>

## **Contact Officers**

Katerina Athanasiadou – Senior Category Manager on behalf of Adult Social Services – Legal & Procurement

PHIL PORTER

Strategic Director of Adult Social Services.

**Lot 1 – Overall Results Breakdown**

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Lot 1 Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Lot 1 Hourly rate Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 1 Hourly Rate Day</b>
Jays Homecare	27.25%	58.71%	85.96%	1st
Mears Care Limited	30.79%	53.65%	84.44%	2nd
Enara Community Care	31.25%	52.29%	83.54%	3rd
Health Vision UK Ltd	30.17%	51.82%	81.98%	4th
Oasis Care Training	20.71%	60.00%	80.71%	5th
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.88%	54.76%	80.64%	6th
Avant Healthcare Services Limited	28.25%	50.89%	79.14%	7th
Excelcare	27.79%	50.89%	78.68%	8th
Ark Home	27.71%	50.89%	78.60%	9th
Care Outlook LTD	24.71%	53.77%	78.48%	10th
London Care Plc	26.79%	51.66%	78.45%	11th
Supreme Care	23.75%	54.29%	78.04%	12th
Sagecare	26.29%	51.66%	77.95%	13th
Westminister	27.79%	50.00%	77.79%	14th
Housing 21	27.08%	50.44%	77.53%	15th
De Vere Care	22.13%	54.29%	76.41%	16th
Voyage Ltd	26.13%	49.57%	75.69%	17th
Lifeways Community Care Limited	23.25%	52.41%	75.66%	18th
Carewatch	26.00%	49.14%	75.14%	19th
Goldsmith Personnel Ltd	25.50%	49.57%	75.07%	20th

Eleanor Nursing & Social Care Ltd	21.75%	53.27%	75.02%	21st
Sanctuary	27.13%	47.11%	74.23%	22nd
Sevacare (UK) Ltd	25.67%	48.31%	73.97%	23rd
MNA Home Care Services Ltd	25.75%	47.90%	73.65%	24th
Onecare-uk	21.33%	51.82%	73.15%	25th
Unique Personnel	20.50%	52.62%	73.12%	26th
Carewatch Barnet & Enfield	26.71%	46.37%	73.08%	27th
Plan Care	27.83%	45.24%	73.07%	28th
ASRA	22.13%	50.89%	73.02%	29th
Home From Hospital Ltd	20.13%	52.70%	72.83%	30th
Aquaflo Nursing and Care Ltd	23.54%	49.14%	72.68%	31st
Active Care & Support Ltd	22.21%	50.44%	72.65%	32nd
Brook Street (UK) Ltd	25.08%	47.50%	72.58%	33rd
Striving for Independence	27.79%	44.04%	71.84%	34th
Standard Nursing Agency	22.33%	49.46%	71.79%	35th
Nestor Primecare Services Limited	21.29%	50.44%	71.73%	36th
Genesis Recruitment Agency	21.67%	50.00%	71.67%	37th
ANA Nursing	25.04%	45.60%	70.64%	38th
Bluebird Care (Harrow )	23.25%	46.34%	69.59%	39th
Extra Mile	20.38%	49.14%	69.51%	40th
Bluebird Care (Brent)	23.08%	46.34%	69.42%	41st
KT's Care Angels Ltd. T/A Carewatch (Brent)	24.83%	43.85%	68.68%	42nd
Soma Healthcare	22.04%	45.60%	67.64%	43rd

Somali Carers	20.92%	46.09%	67.01%	44th
Priory Nursing Agency and Home Care Ltd	20.00%	45.60%	65.60%	45th
Frances Taylor Foundation	23.17%	40.43%	63.59%	46th

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Lot 1 Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Lot 1 Live In 24 hr Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 1 Live In 24 Hours Rate</b>
ANA Nursing	25.04%	59.11%	84.15%	1st
Enara Community Care	31.25%	51.28%	82.53%	2nd
Health Vision UK Ltd	30.17%	52.36%	82.53%	3rd
Eleanor Nursing & Social Care Ltd	21.75%	60.00%	81.75%	4th
Aquaflo Nursing and Care Ltd	23.54%	53.77%	77.31%	5th
Ark Home	27.71%	47.90%	75.61%	6th
Onecare-uk	21.33%	53.99%	75.33%	7th
Avant Healthcare Services Limited	28.25%	46.65%	74.90%	8th
De Vere Care	22.13%	50.80%	72.93%	9th
London Care Plc	26.79%	45.28%	72.07%	10th
Supreme Care	23.75%	48.00%	71.75%	11th
Sagecare	26.29%	45.28%	71.57%	12th
Goldsmith Personnel Ltd	25.50%	46.07%	71.57%	13th
KT's Care Angels Ltd. T/A Carewatch (Brent)	24.83%	45.87%	70.70%	14th
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.88%	43.78%	69.65%	15th
Priory Nursing Agency and Home Care Ltd	20.00%	48.32%	68.32%	16th
Home From Hospital Ltd	20.13%	47.29%	67.42%	17th
Soma Healthcare	22.04%	45.05%	67.09%	18th

Extra Mile	20.38%	46.08%	66.46%	19th
Westminister	27.79%	38.40%	66.19%	20th
Unique Personnel	20.50%	43.64%	64.14%	21st
Carewatch	26.00%	35.56%	61.56%	22nd
Carewatch Barnet & Enfield	26.71%	32.91%	59.62%	23rd
MNA Home Care Services Ltd	25.75%	33.61%	59.36%	24th
Frances Taylor Foundation	23.17%	35.78%	58.95%	25th
Care Outlook LTD	24.71%	32.25%	56.96%	26th
Standard Nursing Agency	22.33%	34.49%	56.82%	27th
Nestor Primecare Services Limited	21.29%	34.00%	55.29%	28th
Mears Care Limited	30.79%	23.65%	54.44%	29th
Sevacare (UK) Ltd	25.67%	28.30%	53.97%	30th
Jays Homecare	27.25%	26.67%	53.92%	31st
Bluebird Care (Harrow )	23.25%	30.07%	53.32%	32nd
Bluebird Care (Brent)	23.08%	30.07%	53.15%	33rd
Genesis Recruitment Agency	21.67%	30.00%	51.67%	34th
Plan Care	27.83%	23.82%	51.65%	35th
Voyage Ltd	26.13%	25.13%	51.26%	36th
Sanctuary	27.13%	24.00%	51.13%	37th
Excelcare	27.79%	22.73%	50.52%	38th
Active Care & Support Ltd	22.21%	28.07%	50.28%	39th
Oasis Care Training	20.71%	29.09%	49.80%	40th
ASRA	22.13%	27.58%	49.71%	41st
Lifeways Community Care Limited	23.25%	25.86%	49.11%	42nd
Striving for Independence	27.79%	18.45%	46.24%	43rd
Brook Street (UK) Ltd	25.08%	19.86%	44.95%	44th
Somali Carers	20.92%	19.37%	40.29%	45th



<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Lot 1 Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Lot 1 Sleeping Night Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 1 Sleeping Night Rate</b>
ASRA	22.13%	60.00%	82.13%	1st
Voyage Ltd	26.13%	54.00%	80.13%	2nd
Lifeways Community Care Limited	23.25%	48.60%	71.85%	3rd
Goldsmith Personnel Ltd	25.50%	40.50%	66.00%	4th
Soma Healthcare	22.04%	40.50%	62.54%	5th
Striving for Independence	27.79%	33.06%	60.85%	6th
Mears Care Limited	30.79%	29.91%	60.70%	7th
Health Vision UK Ltd	30.17%	29.91%	60.07%	8th
Avant Healthcare Services Limited	28.25%	31.21%	59.46%	9th
Bluebird Care (Harrow )	23.25%	34.44%	57.69%	10th
Bluebird Care (Brent)	23.08%	34.44%	57.53%	11th
Excelcare	27.79%	27.46%	55.25%	12th
Supreme Care	23.75%	29.91%	53.66%	13th
Enara Community Care	31.25%	20.77%	52.02%	14th
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.88%	26.03%	51.90%	15th
Frances Taylor Foundation	23.17%	28.21%	51.38%	16th
Aquaflo Nursing and Care Ltd	23.54%	27.77%	51.31%	17th
ANA Nursing	25.04%	25.28%	50.32%	18th
Carewatch Barnet & Enfield	26.71%	23.43%	50.14%	19th
Plan Care	27.83%	21.83%	49.66%	20th
Sanctuary	27.13%	22.19%	49.32%	21st
Eleanor Nursing & Social Care Ltd	21.75%	27.00%	48.75%	22nd
Genesis Recruitment Agency	21.67%	27.00%	48.67%	23rd
Westminster	27.79%	20.46%	48.25%	24th
Carewatch	26.00%	21.84%	47.84%	25th
Ark Home	27.71%	19.98%	47.69%	26th

Care Outlook LTD	24.71%	22.36%	47.07%	27th
London Care Plc	26.79%	20.21%	47.00%	28th
KT's Care Angels Ltd. T/A Carewatch (Brent)	24.83%	22.16%	46.99%	29th
Priory Nursing Agency and Home Care Ltd	20.00%	26.96%	46.96%	30th
Standard Nursing Agency	22.33%	24.58%	46.91%	31st
Sagecare	26.29%	20.21%	46.50%	32nd
Extra Mile	20.38%	25.92%	46.30%	33rd
Jays Homecare	27.25%	18.87%	46.12%	34th
Brook Street (UK) Ltd	25.08%	19.84%	44.92%	35th
Nestor Primecare Services Limited	21.29%	22.87%	44.16%	36th
De Vere Care	22.13%	21.98%	44.10%	37th
Oasis Care Training	20.71%	23.14%	43.85%	38th
Onecare-uk	21.33%	22.44%	43.78%	39th
Unique Personnel	20.50%	23.25%	43.75%	40th
Active Care & Support Ltd	22.21%	20.58%	42.79%	41st
MNA Home Care Services Ltd	25.75%	17.02%	42.77%	42nd
Sevacare (UK) Ltd	25.67%	15.73%	41.39%	43rd
Home From Hospital Ltd	20.13%	19.46%	39.59%	44th
Somali Carers	20.92%	17.49%	38.41%	45th

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Lot 1 Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Lot 1 Waking Night Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 1 Waking Night Rate</b>
ANA Nursing	25.04%	60.00%	85.04%	1st
Enara Community Care	31.25%	53.16%	84.41%	2nd
Oasis Care Training	20.71%	57.81%	78.52%	3rd
Soma Healthcare	22.04%	55.49%	77.54%	4th
Avant Healthcare Services Limited	28.25%	49.04%	77.29%	5th
Care Outlook LTD	24.71%	51.76%	76.47%	6th
Jays Homecare	27.25%	47.63%	74.88%	7th
Westminster	27.79%	44.90%	72.69%	8th

De Vere Care	22.13%	50.48%	72.60%	9th
Health Vision UK Ltd	30.17%	42.04%	72.21%	10th
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.88%	46.23%	72.10%	11th
Mears Care Limited	30.79%	41.23%	72.02%	12th
Goldsmith Personnel Ltd	25.50%	46.25%	71.75%	13th
London Care Plc	26.79%	44.68%	71.47%	14th
Bluebird Care (Harrow )	23.25%	48.17%	71.42%	15th
Bluebird Care (Brent)	23.08%	48.17%	71.25%	16th
Sagecare	26.29%	44.68%	70.97%	17th
Carewatch Barnet & Enfield	26.71%	43.87%	70.58%	18th
Supreme Care	23.75%	44.04%	67.79%	19th
Ark Home	27.71%	39.39%	67.10%	20th
Excelcare	27.79%	39.19%	66.98%	21st
Sevacare (UK) Ltd	25.67%	41.29%	66.96%	22nd
KT's Care Angels Ltd. T/A Carewatch (Brent)	24.83%	41.93%	66.76%	23rd
MNA Home Care Services Ltd	25.75%	40.89%	66.64%	24th
Plan Care	27.83%	38.73%	66.56%	25th
Voyage Ltd	26.13%	40.21%	66.34%	26th
Carewatch	26.00%	39.87%	65.87%	27th
Active Care & Support Ltd	22.21%	43.42%	65.63%	28th
Priory Nursing Agency and Home Care Ltd	20.00%	45.47%	65.47%	29th
Sanctuary	27.13%	38.22%	65.34%	30th
ASRA	22.13%	42.70%	64.83%	31st
Unique Personnel	20.50%	43.80%	64.30%	32nd
Aquaflo Nursing and Care Ltd	23.54%	39.87%	63.41%	33rd
Lifeways Community Care Limited	23.25%	39.53%	62.78%	34th
Standard Nursing Agency	22.33%	40.13%	62.46%	35th
Nestor Primecare Services Limited	21.29%	40.92%	62.22%	36th
Eleanor Nursing & Social Care Ltd	21.75%	40.21%	61.96%	37th
Genesis Recruitment Agency	21.67%	39.87%	61.53%	38th
Somali Carers	20.92%	40.29%	61.21%	39th
Brook Street (UK) Ltd	25.08%	34.26%	59.34%	40th
Home From Hospital Ltd	20.13%	38.54%	58.67%	41st
Onecare-uk	21.33%	36.27%	57.60%	42nd
Extra Mile	20.38%	37.00%	57.37%	43rd
Striving for Independence	27.79%	28.03%	55.82%	44th
Frances Taylor Foundation	23.17%	31.07%	54.24%	45th

## Lot 2 – Overall Results Breakdown

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 2 Extra Care &amp;SH Hour rate</b>
Enara Community Care	31.58%	60.00%	91.58%	1st
Mears Care Limited	31.21%	57.67%	88.88%	2nd
Westminister	28.46%	54.17%	82.63%	3rd
Jays Homecare	26.67%	55.80%	82.47%	4th
London Care Plc	26.79%	55.38%	82.17%	5th
Avant Healthcare Services Limited	27.42%	54.71%	82.13%	6th
Carewatch	26.67%	52.52%	79.19%	7th
Sevacare (UK) Ltd	26.13%	52.64%	78.77%	8th
Carewatch Barnet & Enfield	27.29%	50.73%	78.02%	9th
Housing 21	28.17%	49.38%	77.55%	10th
Supreme Care	23.92%	53.14%	77.06%	11th
Care Outlook LTD	24.04%	52.64%	76.68%	12th
MNA Home Care Services Ltd	26.00%	49.38%	75.38%	13th
Voyage Ltd	26.79%	48.52%	75.31%	14th
Goldsmith Personnel Ltd	25.75%	48.52%	74.27%	15th
Sanctuary	27.13%	46.12%	73.25%	16th
Nestor Primecare Services Limited	21.79%	51.19%	72.98%	17th
ASRA	22.25%	50.73%	72.98%	18th
Onecare-uk	21.79%	50.73%	72.52%	19th
Plan Care	28.17%	44.29%	72.46%	20th
Unique Personnel	20.08%	51.51%	71.59%	21st
Lifeways Community Care Limited	23.67%	47.69%	71.36%	22nd
Metropolitan Support Trust	26.83%	44.26%	71.09%	23rd
Genesis Recruitment Agency	21.63%	48.10%	69.73%	24th
Notting Hill Housing	27.67%	42.01%	69.68%	25th
Extra Mile	20.00%	48.10%	68.10%	26th
Striving for Independence	27.75%	40.14%	67.89%	27th
Frances Taylor Foundation	23.33%	44.29%	67.62%	28th
Somali Carers	20.58%	45.12%	65.70%	29th
Bluebird Care (Harrow )	23.13%	42.27%	65.40%	30th
Bluebird Care (Brent)	22.96%	42.27%	65.23%	31st

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 2 Extra Care &amp;SH 24 Hour rate</b>
Onecare-uk	21.79%	60.00%	81.79%	1st
Avant Healthcare Services Limited	27.42%	51.84%	79.26%	2nd
Extra Mile	20.00%	51.21%	71.21%	3rd
Unique Personnel	20.08%	48.49%	68.57%	4th
MNA Home Care Services Ltd	26.00%	39.31%	65.31%	5th
Carewatch Barnet & Enfield	27.29%	36.58%	63.87%	6th
Care Outlook LTD	24.04%	35.84%	59.88%	7th
Nestor Primecare Services Limited	21.79%	37.79%	59.58%	8th
Mears Care Limited	31.21%	28.12%	59.33%	9th
Genesis Recruitment Agency	21.63%	35.56%	57.19%	10th
Enara Community Care	31.58%	23.15%	54.73%	11th
Supreme Care	23.92%	30.40%	54.32%	12th
Westminister	28.46%	23.05%	51.51%	13th
Sanctuary	27.13%	22.45%	49.58%	14th
Jays Homecare	26.67%	22.23%	48.90%	15th
London Care Plc	26.79%	22.00%	48.79%	16th
Carewatch	26.67%	21.86%	48.53%	17th
Housing 21	28.17%	19.67%	47.84%	18th
Sevacare (UK) Ltd	26.13%	21.58%	47.71%	19th
Frances Taylor Foundation	23.33%	24.14%	47.47%	20th
Voyage Ltd	26.79%	19.33%	46.12%	21st
Plan Care	28.17%	17.64%	45.81%	22nd
Metropolitan Support Trust	26.83%	17.63%	44.46%	23rd
Notting Hill Housing	27.67%	16.73%	44.40%	24th
Bluebird Care (Harrow )	23.13%	20.48%	43.61%	25th
Bluebird Care (Brent)	22.96%	20.48%	43.44%	26th
ASRA	22.25%	20.57%	42.82%	27th
Lifeways Community Care Limited	23.67%	19.00%	42.67%	28th
Striving for Independence	27.75%	14.72%	42.47%	29th
Somali Carers	20.58%	21.52%	42.10%	30th
Goldsmith Personnel Ltd	25.75%	12.45%	38.20%	31st

### Lot 3 – Overall Results Breakdown

Provider Name	Lot 3 Quality Score % out of 40%	Lot 3 Pricing Score % out of 60%	Lot 3 Total Combined Score out of 100%	Ranking for Lot 3
Mears Care Limited	29.25%	55.66%	84.91%	1st
Jays Homecare	25.92%	57.00%	82.92%	2nd
Oasis Care Training	20.17%	60.00%	80.17%	3rd
Enara Community Care	29.50%	48.72%	78.22%	4th
Care Outlook LTD	24.08%	53.77%	77.85%	5th
Health Vision UK Ltd	29.00%	48.31%	77.31%	6th
Sihara	21.67%	55.38%	77.05%	7th
London Care Plc	25.83%	51.20%	77.03%	8th
Carewatch	25.92%	49.14%	75.06%	9th
Carewatch Barnet & Enfield	26.42%	46.37%	72.79%	10th
Supreme Care	22.25%	50.44%	72.69%	11th
Unique Personnel	20.00%	52.62%	72.62%	12th
Brook Street (UK) Ltd	24.42%	47.50%	71.92%	13th
Standard Nursing Agency	22.08%	49.46%	71.54%	14th
Genesis Recruitment Agency	21.42%	50.00%	71.42%	15th
De Vere Care	21.33%	49.57%	70.90%	16th
KT's Care Angels Ltd. T/A Carewatch (Brent)	23.67%	46.72%	70.39%	17th
Active Care & Support Ltd	20.67%	49.57%	70.24%	18th
MNA Home Care Services Ltd	24.50%	45.60%	70.10%	19th
Plan Care	25.83%	44.19%	70.02%	20th
Sevacare (UK) Ltd	23.83%	45.97%	69.80%	21st
Onecare-uk	21.00%	48.31%	69.31%	22nd
Ark Home	26.08%	42.22%	68.30%	23rd
Extra Mile	20.08%	47.90%	67.98%	24th
Nestor Primecare Services Limited	20.33%	47.50%	67.83%	25th
Housing 21	25.92%	40.43%	66.35%	26th
Somali Carers	20.25%	46.09%	66.34%	27th
Eleanor Nursing & Social Care Ltd	20.08%	43.85%	63.93%	28th
Striving for Independence	26.17%	37.75%	63.92%	29th
Metropolitan Support Trust	27.83%	34.86%	62.69%	30th
Bluebird Care (Harrow )	22.17%	40.43%	62.60%	31st
Bluebird Care (Brent)	22.00%	40.43%	62.43%	32nd

**Lot 4 – Overall Results Breakdown**

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 4 Level 1</b>
Excelcare	27.58%	60.00%	87.58%	1st
Avant Healthcare Services Limited	27.75%	54.24%	81.99%	2nd
Oasis Care Training	21.42%	59.71%	81.13%	3rd
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.58%	55.27%	80.85%	4th
Jays Homecare	26.58%	54.00%	80.58%	5th
De Vere Care	22.92%	56.25%	79.17%	6th
Goldsmith Personnel Ltd	25.92%	52.83%	78.75%	7th
Genesis Recruitment Agency	22.25%	54.73%	76.98%	8th
Standard Nursing Agency	23.25%	52.71%	75.96%	9th
MNA Home Care Services Ltd	26.17%	48.60%	74.77%	10th
Active Care & Support Ltd	22.83%	51.48%	74.31%	11th
KT's Care Angels Ltd. T/A Carewatch (Brent)	24.08%	49.80%	73.88%	12th
Somali Carers	21.67%	49.12%	70.79%	13th
Unique Personnel	20.92%	49.42%	70.34%	14th
Active Assistance	22.63%	44.34%	66.97%	15th
Ark Home	25.58%	40.77%	66.35%	16th

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 4 Level 2</b>
Excelcare	27.58%	60.00%	87.58%	1st
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.58%	55.27%	80.85%	2nd
De Vere Care	22.92%	56.03%	78.95%	3rd
Avant Healthcare Services Limited	27.75%	51.16%	78.91%	4th
Jays Homecare	26.58%	52.07%	78.65%	5th
Oasis Care Training	21.42%	55.44%	76.86%	6th
Goldsmith Personnel Ltd	25.92%	50.63%	76.55%	7th
Standard Nursing Agency	23.25%	52.71%	75.96%	8th
MNA Home Care Services Ltd	26.17%	48.60%	74.77%	9th
Active Care & Support Ltd	22.83%	51.48%	74.31%	10th
KT's Care Angels Ltd. T/A Carewatch (Brent)	24.08%	49.80%	73.88%	11th
Somali Carers	21.67%	49.12%	70.79%	12th
Unique Personnel	20.92%	49.42%	70.34%	13th
Active Assistance	22.63%	44.34%	66.97%	14th
Ark Home	25.58%	38.21%	63.79%	15th

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 4 Level 3</b>
Excelcare	27.58%	60.00%	87.58%	1st
De Vere Care	22.92%	59.36%	82.28%	2nd
Goldsmith Personnel Ltd	25.92%	53.75%	79.67%	3rd
Jays Homecare	26.58%	53.01%	79.59%	4th
Avant Healthcare Services Limited	27.75%	51.26%	79.01%	5th
Standard Nursing Agency	23.25%	53.71%	76.96%	6th
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.58%	51.19%	76.77%	7th
Active Care & Support Ltd	22.83%	53.75%	76.58%	8th
Somali Carers	21.67%	52.16%	73.83%	9th
MNA Home Care Services Ltd	26.17%	46.74%	72.91%	10th
KT's Care Angels Ltd. T/A Carewatch (Brent)	24.08%	48.53%	72.61%	11th
Unique Personnel	20.92%	49.14%	70.06%	12th
Active Assistance	22.63%	47.08%	69.71%	13th
Oasis Care Training	21.42%	45.85%	67.27%	14th
Ark Home	25.58%	38.39%	63.97%	15th

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 4 Level 4</b>
Excelcare	27.58%	60.74%	88.32%	1st
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.58%	59.41%	84.99%	2nd
De Vere Care	22.92%	60.00%	82.92%	3rd
Goldsmith Personnel Ltd	25.92%	56.78%	82.70%	4th
Oasis Care Training	21.42%	58.65%	80.07%	5th
Jays Homecare	26.58%	51.55%	78.13%	6th
Standard Nursing Agency	23.25%	54.38%	77.63%	7th
Active Care & Support Ltd	22.83%	53.97%	76.80%	8th
Avant Healthcare Services Limited	27.75%	48.22%	75.97%	9th
KT's Care Angels Ltd. T/A Carewatch (Brent)	24.08%	51.72%	75.80%	10th
Somali Carers	21.67%	52.80%	74.47%	11th
MNA Home Care Services Ltd	26.17%	47.32%	73.49%	12th
Unique Personnel	20.92%	49.75%	70.67%	13th
Active Assistance	22.63%	47.66%	70.29%	14th
Ark Home	25.58%	37.97%	63.55%	15th



### Lot 5 – Overall Results Breakdown

Provider Name	Lot 5 Quality Score % out of 40%	Pricing Score % out of 60%	Total Combined Score out of 100%	Ranking for Lot 5 Hourly Rate Day
Health Vision UK Ltd	29.54%	57.46%	87.00%	1st
Supreme Care	21.88%	60.00%	81.88%	2nd
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.63%	53.81%	79.44%	3rd
Standard Nursing Agency	22.79%	56.46%	79.25%	4th
Genesis Recruitment Agency	20.25%	58.96%	79.21%	5th
Ark Home	27.50%	50.22%	77.72%	6th
Aquaflo Nursing and Care Ltd	23.00%	54.68%	77.68%	7th
Nestor Primecare Services Limited	21.50%	54.24%	75.74%	8th
Oasis Care Training	20.79%	54.24%	75.03%	9th
Care Outlook LTD	22.92%	51.33%	74.25%	10th
Active Assistance	21.63%	50.22%	71.85%	11th
Eleanor Nursing & Social Care Ltd	21.29%	48.09%	69.38%	12th
Striving for Independence	27.33%	41.09%	68.42%	13th

Provider Name	Lot 5 Quality Score % out of 40%	Pricing Score % out of 60%	Total Combined Score out of 100%	Ranking for Lot 5 Live In 24 Hour Rate
Health Vision UK Ltd	29.54%	60.00%	89.54%	1st
Aquaflo Nursing and Care Ltd	23.00%	63.00%	86.00%	2nd
Ark Home	27.50%	45.73%	73.23%	3rd
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.63%	44.23%	69.86%	4th
Eleanor Nursing & Social Care Ltd	21.29%	46.15%	67.44%	5th
Active Assistance	21.63%	42.35%	63.98%	6th
Nestor Primecare Services Limited	21.50%	38.92%	60.42%	7th
Care Outlook LTD	22.92%	36.86%	59.78%	8th
Genesis Recruitment Agency	20.25%	37.50%	57.75%	9th
Supreme Care	21.88%	34.20%	56.08%	10th
Standard Nursing Agency	22.79%	28.74%	51.53%	11th

Oasis Care Training	20.79%	23.75%	44.54%	12th
Striving for Independence	27.33%	17.18%	44.51%	13th

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Lot 5 Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 5 Sleeping Night Rate</b>
Health Vision UK Ltd	29.54%	55.71%	85.25%	1st
Supreme Care	21.88%	60.00%	81.88%	2nd
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.63%	56.20%	81.83%	3rd
Striving for Independence	27.33%	53.28%	80.61%	4th
Aquaflo Nursing and Care Ltd	23.00%	55.71%	78.71%	5th
Genesis Recruitment Agency	20.25%	54.17%	74.42%	6th
Standard Nursing Agency	22.79%	47.39%	70.18%	7th
Active Assistance	21.63%	46.43%	68.06%	8th
Ark Home	27.50%	37.06%	64.56%	9th
Eleanor Nursing & Social Care Ltd	21.29%	40.12%	61.41%	10th
Nestor Primecare Services Limited	21.50%	39.00%	60.50%	11th
Care Outlook LTD	22.92%	28.61%	51.53%	12th
Oasis Care Training	20.79%	30.09%	50.88%	13th

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Lot 5 Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 5 Waking Night Rate</b>
Health Vision UK Ltd	29.54%	53.39%	82.93%	1st
Supreme Care	21.88%	60.00%	81.88%	2nd
Oasis Care Training	20.79%	57.27%	78.06%	3rd
Standard Nursing Agency	22.79%	52.46%	75.25%	4th
Genesis Recruitment Agency	20.25%	54.31%	74.56%	5th
Aquaflo Nursing and Care Ltd	23.00%	50.81%	73.81%	6th
Nestor Primecare Services Limited	21.50%	50.40%	71.90%	7th
Ark Home	27.50%	43.12%	70.62%	8th
Lifecare Professionals Limited	25.63%	43.93%	69.56%	9th
Active Assistance	21.63%	44.46%	66.09%	10th
Eleanor Nursing & Social Care Ltd	21.29%	44.68%	65.97%	11th
Striving for Independence	27.33%	33.11%	60.44%	12th
Care Outlook LTD	22.92%	36.52%	59.44%	13th

**Lot 6 – Overall Results Breakdown**

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Lot 6 Quality Score % out of 40%</b>	<b>Lot 6 Pricing Score % out of 60%</b>	<b>Total Combined Score out of 100%</b>	<b>Ranking for Lot 6</b>
Mears Care Limited	28.92%	58.58%	87.50%	1st
Jays Homecare	27.50%	60.00%	87.50%	2nd
Voyage Ltd	26.83%	52.17%	79.00%	3rd
Housing 21	27.67%	51.28%	78.95%	4th
Genesis Recruitment Agency	21.25%	54.05%	75.30%	5th
ASRA	22.17%	52.17%	74.34%	6th
Penrose	22.33%	51.72%	74.05%	7th
Lifeways Community Care Limited	22.17%	51.25%	73.42%	8th
Metropolitan Support Trust	24.50%	45.43%	69.93%	9th
Somali Carers	20.25%	48.52%	68.77%	10th
Striving for Independence	27.83%	39.74%	67.57%	11th
Frances Taylor Foundation	23.42%	42.55%	65.97%	12th
Notting Hill Housing	25.50%	38.92%	64.42%	13th

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix 2 – Quality Evaluation Weightings per Lot

The question % breakdown below was applicable to all bidders bidding for Lot 1. It should be noted that Lot 1 was the generic principal specification and therefore didn't have any separate lot specific questions.

Section/Question - Lot 1	Q Weight(%)
<b>Section 1). Generic Questions</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1. Meeting the needs of the individual (service user) and customer (local authority) focus</b>	
<p>1.1 Please describe how your organisation will assess and meet the care and support needs of individuals in a flexible way?</p> <p>Bidders response to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertaking an assessment of need and developing the individual care/support plan taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice?</li> <li>• Risk assessment (both in terms of the individual and the environment in which the care will be delivered)</li> <li>• Review of individual care and support needs</li> </ul>	3%
<p>1.2 Please describe how your Quality Assurance processes would address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respecting service users dignity and maintaining their overall health and well being</li> <li>• Identifying and responding to service users changing needs</li> <li>• Incorporating service user feedback including satisfaction surveys</li> <li>• Maintaining CQC registration and/or other accreditations</li> </ul> <p>N.B. your response to this question should demonstrate how your organisation will deliver an effective outcomes focused care service to vulnerable people with very different individual needs in accordance with the 28 CQC standards outlined in the Lot 1 specification.</p>	2%
<p>1.3 Please provide examples of how you will recruit locally and support the local community. e.g. investing in your staff to develop their skills and in doing this how you will address any equality and diversity considerations.</p>	1%
<p>1.4 How will your organisation deliver the required services taking into account the demographics and diverse nature of the population of the Purchasing Authorities? Bidders response should demonstrate a persons centred approach.</p>	1%
<p>1.5 How would you ensure that delivery of care is carried out in a flexible way taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice?</p> <p>In addition, 'Putting People First' requires local authorities to make personal budgets available for people with ongoing care and support needs as well as the more recent Social Care White Paper and 'Caring for our Future'- Reforming Care and Support, and the Draft Care and Support Bill which are all part of the wider transformation agenda for social care.</p> <p>Please demonstrate how Service Users can exercise choice and control over how their care is provided?</p>	2%
<p>1.6 How will you ensure service users will have the freedom to make their own choices and how will you promote independence within a safe environment.</p> <p>What interventions will you take to ensure this occurs?</p>	2%

<b>2. Approach to safeguarding, performance and safe environment</b>	
Safeguarding 2.1 Please describe how your organisation will ensure that your staff and managers are able to recognise, identify and respond appropriately to safeguarding concerns and signs of potential abuse and exploitation in your day to day operation.	3%
2.2 How does your organisation manage safeguarding incidents and what are your formal procedures in reporting potential safeguarding concerns? - What pro-active measures can you demonstrate to evidence how you implement the safeguarding process in your day to day operation?	3%
Performance 2.3 Please demonstrate how would you identify and address performance issues such as e.g. missed calls/double ups where one carer has turned up, which could lead to safeguarding concerns.	2%
<b>3. Approach to staff recruitment, retention and training</b>	
Recruitment 3.1 Please explain how you will ensure the effective recruitment of local high quality care workers to meet service demands Your response should also include how would the local branch manager be supported in their role in light of changing service demands and staff requirements impacting service delivery?	2%
Retention and Training: 3.2 Please demonstrate how you can confidently achieve and maintain high quality staff retention over the life of the framework and ensure that service users are supported by suitably trained staff? Your response should also address how you will motivate and train up existing staff.	1%
3.3 Medication and working with Local Health practitioners – Not lot 6. Please explain how you would train staff on different levels of medication support including the prompting or administration of medication and ensuring safety of medication support?	2%
<b>4. Mobility and capacity building</b>	
4.1 Please demonstrate how the tendered hourly rate you bid to the WLA: a) is feasible and achievable in delivering the service to the required standard and b) is financially, locally and socially sustainable over the life of the framework.  The bidder when explaining in detail their hourly rate may refer to past performances or lessons from elsewhere to justify the answer. a) The bid should describe in detail assumptions made. b) The method statement should explain how these assumptions offer value for money.	1%
4.2 At PQQ stage you marked the wards where you will be able to deliver services at set intervals of the framework agreement, the outset, within 6 months, within the anniversary of the framework agreement etc.  Please detail and provide an in depth mobilisation plan (showing timescales) and explain how your organisation will ensure you will deliver services in the wards highlighted at the PQQ stage in a timely manner?	2%
4.3 Out of Hours & Rostering: Please demonstrate how your rosters are fair, flexible and cover emergencies; out of hours and 'unsociable' hours, including calls that are not rostered. Please provide an anonymised current roster to demonstrate the above and to ensure that the service requirement can meet demand.	1%
<b>5. Business Continuity Planning</b>	

5.1 Please explain what steps you will take to minimise the impact of major incidents or issues affecting the organisation both internal and external in the delivery of the services you are bidding for?  <u>Please do not attach business continuity policy</u>  Bidders should have clear plans about how their will manage any disruption to their business, with particular regard to: - No access to offices e.g. terror alert and utility failure - Transport disruptions. - Extreme weather conditions - Public Health concerns e.g. flu epidemic - Staff shortage e.g. labour disputes, absenteeism around public/religious holidays and high levels of staff sickness - Information breach e.g. loss of confidential information, loss of roster - Threats to Financial stability/business risks N.B. IT failure to be addressed in section 6	2%
<b>6. Information systems and their use for monitoring service provision</b>	
6.1 In the absence of ECMS (Electronic Call Monitoring System) in the service user home please describe what steps you would take to manage and monitor your staff and the service	3%
6.2 Please demonstrate how you will ensure commitment from all of your staff to use ECMS and what steps you will take in enforcing the use of this as part of the service provision.	2%
6.3 Please describe in detail how you will use ECMS to achieve the required compliance levels for this service: • Missed calls • Double ups • Rostering of calls • Lost/stolen rosters • Out of hours	2%
<b>7. Approach to partnership working with the Council and others</b>	
7.1 Give examples of how you will work creatively and innovatively with the Council and other agencies/stakeholders and families to better deliver the service..	1%
7.2 How will service users be made aware of your complaints procedure and how will you ensure that the outcomes of the complaints will be used to improve service delivery.	2%
Total	40%

The question % breakdown below will apply for all bidders bidding for Lot 2.

Section/Question - Lot 2	Q Weight(%)
<b>Section 1). Generic Questions</b>	%
<b>1. Meeting the needs of the individual (service user) and customer (local authority) focus</b>	
1.1 Please describe how your organisation will assess and meet the care and support needs of individuals in a flexible way?  Bidders response to include the following: • Undertaking an assessment of need and developing the individual care/support plan taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice? • Risk assessment (both in terms of the individual and the environment in which the care will be delivered) • Review of individual care and support needs	2%

<p>1.2 Please describe how your Quality Assurance processes would address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respecting service users dignity and maintaining their overall health and well being</li> <li>• Identifying and responding to service users changing needs</li> <li>• Incorporating service user feedback including satisfaction surveys</li> <li>• Maintaining CQC registration and/or other accreditations</li> </ul> <p>N.B. your response to this question should demonstrate how your organisation will deliver an effective outcomes focused care service to vulnerable people with very different individual needs in accordance with the 28 CQC standards outlined in the Lot 1 specification.</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p>1.3 Please provide examples of how you will recruit locally and support the local community. e.g. investing in your staff to develop their skills and in doing this how you will address any equality and diversity considerations.</p>	<p>1%</p>
<p>1.4 How will your organisation deliver the required services taking into account the demographics and diverse nature of the population of the Purchasing Authorities? Bidders response should demonstrate a persons centred approach.</p>	<p>1%</p>
<p>1.5 How would you ensure that delivery of care is carried out in a flexible way taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice?</p> <p>In addition, 'Putting People First' requires local authorities to make personal budgets available for people with ongoing care and support needs as well as the more recent Social Care White Paper and 'Caring for our Future'- Reforming Care and Support, and the Draft Care and Support Bill which are all part of the wider transformation agenda for social care.</p> <p>Please demonstrate how Service Users can exercise choice and control over how their care is provided?</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p>1.6 How will you ensure service users will have the freedom to make their own choices and how will you promote independence within a safe environment.</p> <p>What interventions will you take to ensure this occurs?</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p><b>2. Approach to safeguarding, performance and safe environment</b></p>	
<p>Safeguarding 2.1 Please describe how your organisation will ensure that your staff and managers are able to recognise, identify and respond appropriately to safeguarding concerns and signs of potential abuse and exploitation in your day to day operation.</p>	<p>3%</p>
<p>2.2 How does your organisation manage safeguarding incidents and what are your formal procedures in reporting potential safeguarding concerns? - What pro-active measures can you demonstrate to evidence how you implement the safeguarding process in your day to day operation?</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p>Performance 2.3 Please demonstrate how would you identify and address performance issues such as e.g. missed calls/double ups where one carer has turned up, which could lead to safeguarding concerns.</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p><b>3. Approach to staff recruitment, retention and training</b></p>	



<p>Recruitment</p> <p>3.1 Please explain how you will ensure the effective recruitment of local high quality care workers to meet service demands</p> <p>Your response should also include how would the local branch manager be supported in their role in light of changing service demands and staff requirements impacting service delivery?</p>	2%
<p>Retention and Training:</p> <p>3.2 Please demonstrate how you can confidently achieve and maintain high quality staff retention over the life of the framework and ensure that service users are supported by suitably trained staff? Your response should also address how you will motivate and train up existing staff.</p>	1%
<p>3.3 Medication and working with Local Health practitioners – Not lot 6.</p> <p>Please explain how you would train staff on different levels of medication support including the prompting or administration of medication and ensuring safety of medication support?</p>	1%
<p><b>4. Mobility and capacity building</b></p>	
<p>4.1 Please demonstrate how the tendered hourly rate you bid to the WLA:</p> <p>a) is feasible and achievable in delivering the service to the required standard and</p> <p>b) is financially, locally and socially sustainable over the life of the framework.</p> <p>The bidder when explaining in detail their hourly rate may refer to past performances or lessons from elsewhere to justify the answer.</p> <p>a) The bid should describe in detail assumptions made.</p> <p>b) The method statement should explain how these assumptions offer value for money.</p>	1%
<p>4.2 At PQQ stage you marked the wards where you will be able to deliver services at set intervals of the framework agreement, the outset, within 6 months, within the anniversary of the framework agreement etc.</p> <p>Please detail and provide an in depth mobilisation plan (showing timescales) and explain how your organisation will ensure you will deliver services in the wards highlighted at the PQQ stage in a timely manner?</p>	2%
<p>4.3 Out of Hours &amp; Rostering:</p> <p>Please demonstrate how your rosters are fair, flexible and cover emergencies; out of hours and 'unsociable' hours, including calls that are not rostered.</p> <p>Please provide an anonymised current roster to demonstrate the above and to ensure that the service requirement can meet demand.</p>	1%
<p><b>5. Business Continuity Planning</b></p>	
<p>5.1 Please explain what steps you will take to minimise the impact of major incidents or issues affecting the organisation both internal and external in the delivery of the services you are bidding for?</p> <p>Please do not attach business continuity policy</p> <p>Bidders should have clear plans about how their will manage any disruption to their business, with particular regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No access to offices e.g. terror alert and utility failure</li> <li>- Transport disruptions.</li> <li>- Extreme weather conditions</li> <li>- Public Health concerns e.g. flu epidemic</li> <li>- Staff shortage e.g. labour disputes, absenteeism around public/religious holidays and high levels of staff sickness</li> <li>- Information breach e.g. loss of confidential information, loss of roster</li> <li>- Threats to Financial stability/business risks</li> </ul> <p>N.B. IT failure to be addressed in section 6</p>	2%
<p><b>6. Information systems and their use for monitoring service provision</b></p>	

6.1 In the absence of ECMS (Electronic Call Monitoring System) in the service user home please describe what steps you would take to manage and monitor your staff and the service	3%
6.2 Please demonstrate how you will ensure commitment from all of your staff to use ECMS and what steps you will take in enforcing the use of this as part of the service provision.	1%
6.3 Please describe in detail how you will use ECMS to achieve the required compliance levels for this service: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missed calls</li> <li>• Double ups</li> <li>• Rostering of calls</li> <li>• Lost/stolen rosters</li> <li>• Out of hours</li> </ul>	2%
<b>7. Approach to partnership working with the Council and others</b>	
7.1 Give examples of how you will work creatively and innovatively with the Council and other agencies/stakeholders and families to better deliver the service..	1%
7.2 How will service users be made aware of your complaints procedure and how will you ensure that the outcomes of the complaints will be used to improve service delivery.	2%
<b>Section 2.2). Lot 2</b>	
<b>2.2.1. Approach to partnership working with the Council and others.</b>	
2.2.1. Please explain how will you work with the housing provider/landlord and/or housing related support provider to provide a holistic experience for the service users living in an extra care/supported housing scheme?	2%
<b>2.2.2. Meeting the needs of the individual and customer focus.</b>	
2.2.2.1 How will you ensure the continuity of care to deliver a 24/7 service taking into account that service user needs, wishes and choices, in a person centre way.	2%
Total	40%

The question % breakdown below will apply for all bidders bidding for Lot 3.

Section/Question - Lot 3	Q Weight(%)
<b>Section 1). Generic Questions</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1. Meeting the needs of the individual (service user) and customer (local authority) focus</b>	
1.1 Please describe how your organisation will assess and meet the care and support needs of individuals in a flexible way?  Bidders response to include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertaking an assessment of need and developing the individual care/support plan taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice?</li> <li>• Risk assessment (both in terms of the individual and the environment in which the care will be delivered)</li> <li>• Review of individual care and support needs</li> </ul>	2%
1.2 Please describe how your Quality Assurance processes would address:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respecting service users dignity and maintaining their overall health and well being</li> <li>• Identifying and responding to service users changing needs</li> <li>• Incorporating service user feedback including satisfaction surveys</li> <li>• Maintaining CQC registration and/or other accreditations</li> </ul>	
N.B. your response to this question should demonstrate how your organisation will deliver an	2%

<p>effective outcomes focused care service to vulnerable people with very different individual needs in accordance with the 28 CQC standards outlined in the Lot 1 specification.</p>	
<p>1.3 Please provide examples of how you will recruit locally and support the local community. e.g. investing in your staff to develop their skills and in doing this how you will address any equality and diversity considerations.</p>	1%
<p>1.4 How will your organisation deliver the required services taking into account the demographics and diverse nature of the population of the Purchasing Authorities? Bidders response should demonstrate a persons centred approach.</p>	1%
<p>1.5 How would you ensure that delivery of care is carried out in a flexible way taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice?</p> <p>In addition, 'Putting People First' requires local authorities to make personal budgets available for people with ongoing care and support needs as well as the more recent Social Care White Paper and 'Caring for our Future'- Reforming Care and Support, and the Draft Care and Support Bill which are all part of the wider transformation agenda for social care.</p> <p>Please demonstrate how Service Users can exercise choice and control over how their care is provided?</p>	2%
<p>1.6 How will you ensure service users will have the freedom to make their own choices and how will you promote independence within a safe environment.</p> <p>What interventions will you take to ensure this occurs?</p>	2%
<p><b>2. Approach to safeguarding, performance and safe environment</b></p>	
<p>Safeguarding 2.1 Please describe how your organisation will ensure that your staff and managers are able to recognise, identify and respond appropriately to safeguarding concerns and signs of potential abuse and exploitation in your day to day operation.</p>	2%
<p>2.2 How does your organisation manage safeguarding incidents and what are your formal procedures in reporting potential safeguarding concerns? - What pro-active measures can you demonstrate to evidence how you implement the safeguarding process in your day to day operation?</p>	2%
<p>Performance 2.3 Please demonstrate how would you identify and address performance issues such as e.g. missed calls/double ups where one carer has turned up, which could lead to safeguarding concerns.</p>	2%
<p><b>3. Approach to staff recruitment, retention and training</b></p>	

<p>Recruitment</p> <p>3.1 Please explain how you will ensure the effective recruitment of local high quality care workers to meet service demands</p> <p>Your response should also include how would the local branch manager be supported in their role in light of changing service demands and staff requirements impacting service delivery?</p>	2%
<p>Retention and Training:</p> <p>3.2 Please demonstrate how you can confidently achieve and maintain high quality staff retention over the life of the framework and ensure that service users are supported by suitably trained staff? Your response should also address how you will motivate and train up existing staff.</p>	1%
<p>3.3 Medication and working with Local Health practitioners – Not lot 6.</p> <p>Please explain how you would train staff on different levels of medication support including the prompting or administration of medication and ensuring safety of medication support?</p>	1%
<p><b>4. Mobility and capacity building</b></p>	
<p>4.1 Please demonstrate how the tendered hourly rate you bid to the WLA:</p> <p>a) is feasible and achievable in delivering the service to the required standard and</p> <p>b) is financially, locally and socially sustainable over the life of the framework.</p> <p>The bidder when explaining in detail their hourly rate may refer to past performances or lessons from elsewhere to justify the answer.</p> <p>a) The bid should describe in detail assumptions made.</p> <p>b) The method statement should explain how these assumptions offer value for money.</p>	1%
<p>4.2 At PQQ stage you marked the wards where you will be able to deliver services at set intervals of the framework agreement, the outset, within 6 months, within the anniversary of the framework agreement etc.</p> <p>Please detail and provide an in depth mobilisation plan (showing timescales) and explain how your organisation will ensure you will deliver services in the wards highlighted at the PQQ stage in a timely manner?</p>	2%
<p>4.3 Out of Hours &amp; Rostering:</p> <p>Please demonstrate how your rosters are fair, flexible and cover emergencies; out of hours and 'unsociable' hours, including calls that are not rostered.</p> <p>Please provide an anonymised current roster to demonstrate the above and to ensure that the service requirement can meet demand.</p>	1%
<p><b>5. Business Continuity Planning</b></p>	
<p>5.1 Please explain what steps you will take to minimise the impact of major incidents or issues affecting the organisation both internal and external in the delivery of the services you are bidding for?</p> <p>Please do not attach business continuity policy</p> <p>Bidders should have clear plans about how their will manage any disruption to their business, with particular regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No access to offices e.g. terror alert and utility failure</li> <li>- Transport disruptions.</li> <li>- Extreme weather conditions</li> <li>- Public Health concerns e.g. flu epidemic</li> <li>- Staff shortage e.g. labour disputes, absenteeism around public/religious holidays and high levels of staff sickness</li> <li>- Information breach e.g. loss of confidential information, loss of roster</li> <li>- Threats to Financial stability/business risks</li> </ul> <p>N.B. IT failure to be addressed in section 6</p>	2%
<p><b>6. Information systems and their use for monitoring service provision</b></p>	

6.1 In the absence of ECMS (Electronic Call Monitoring System) in the service user home please describe what steps you would take to manage and monitor your staff and the service	2%
6.2 Please demonstrate how you will ensure commitment from all of your staff to use ECMS and what steps you will take in enforcing the use of this as part of the service provision.	1%
6.3 Please describe in detail how you will use ECMS to achieve the required compliance levels for this service: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missed calls</li> <li>• Double ups</li> <li>• Rostering of calls</li> <li>• Lost/stolen rosters</li> <li>• Out of hours</li> </ul>	2%
<b>7. Approach to partnership working with the Council and others</b>	
7.1 Give examples of how you will work creatively and innovatively with the Council and other agencies/stakeholders and families to better deliver the service..	1%
7.2 How will service users be made aware of your complaints procedure and how will you ensure that the outcomes of the complaints will be used to improve service delivery.	2%
<b>Section 2.3). Lot 3</b>	
<b>2.3.1. Meeting the needs of the individual and customer focus.</b>	
2.3.1. Please explain how your organisation will deliver a service with a specific amount of hours to maximise the outcomes and improvements for individuals, and to reduce their ongoing care and support needs?	2%
<b>2.3.2. Approach to partnership working with the Council and others.</b>	
2.3.2. The re-ablement service requires regular, informative communication between various organisations throughout the time limited period of service and hand over. The various parties include the service user, Purchasing Authority, Health Staff, the Provider. How do you plan to work with these partners to ensure a joint working to delivering a successful service, and to hand over the service at the end of the re-ablement period?	2%
<b>2.3.3. Information systems and their use for monitoring service provision.</b>	
2.3.3. The business model for this service will also be different from standard ongoing home support services. Please explain how you will setup your operations to deliver this type of business, including training, scheduling staff, payment management and recruitment.	2%
Total	40%

The question % breakdown below will apply for all bidders bidding for Lot 4.

Section/Question - Lot 4	Q Weight(%)
<b>Section 1). Generic Questions</b>	%
<b>1. Meeting the needs of the individual (service user) and customer (local authority) focus</b>	
1.1 Please describe how your organisation will assess and meet the care and support needs of individuals in a flexible way?  Bidders response to include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertaking an assessment of need and developing the individual care/support plan taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice?</li> <li>• Risk assessment (both in terms of the individual and the environment in which the care will be delivered)</li> <li>• Review of individual care and support needs</li> </ul>	2%

<p>1.2 Please describe how your Quality Assurance processes would address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respecting service users dignity and maintaining their overall health and well being</li> <li>• Identifying and responding to service users changing needs</li> <li>• Incorporating service user feedback including satisfaction surveys</li> <li>• Maintaining CQC registration and/or other accreditations</li> </ul> <p>N.B. your response to this question should demonstrate how your organisation will deliver an effective outcomes focused care service to vulnerable people with very different individual needs in accordance with the 28 CQC standards outlined in the Lot 1 specification.</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p>1.3 Please provide examples of how you will recruit locally and support the local community. e.g. investing in your staff to develop their skills and in doing this how you will address any equality and diversity considerations.</p>	<p>1%</p>
<p>1.4 How will your organisation deliver the required services taking into account the demographics and diverse nature of the population of the Purchasing Authorities? Bidders response should demonstrate a persons centred approach.</p>	<p>1%</p>
<p>1.5 How would you ensure that delivery of care is carried out in a flexible way taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice?</p> <p>In addition, 'Putting People First' requires local authorities to make personal budgets available for people with ongoing care and support needs as well as the more recent Social Care White Paper and 'Caring for our Future'- Reforming Care and Support, and the Draft Care and Support Bill which are all part of the wider transformation agenda for social care.</p> <p>Please demonstrate how Service Users can exercise choice and control over how their care is provided?</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p>1.6 How will you ensure service users will have the freedom to make their own choices and how will you promote independence within a safe environment.</p> <p>What interventions will you take to ensure this occurs?</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p><b>2. Approach to safeguarding, performance and safe environment</b></p>	
<p>Safeguarding 2.1 Please describe how your organisation will ensure that your staff and managers are able to recognise, identify and respond appropriately to safeguarding concerns and signs of potential abuse and exploitation in your day to day operation.</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p>2.2 How does your organisation manage safeguarding incidents and what are your formal procedures in reporting potential safeguarding concerns? - What pro-active measures can you demonstrate to evidence how you implement the safeguarding process in your day to day operation?</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p>Performance 2.3 Please demonstrate how would you identify and address performance issues such as e.g. missed calls/double ups where one carer has turned up, which could lead to safeguarding concerns.</p>	<p>2%</p>

<b>3. Approach to staff recruitment, retention and training</b>	
<p>Recruitment</p> <p>3.1 Please explain how you will ensure the effective recruitment of local high quality care workers to meet service demands</p> <p>Your response should also include how would the local branch manager be supported in their role in light of changing service demands and staff requirements impacting service delivery?</p>	2%
<p>Retention and Training:</p> <p>3.2 Please demonstrate how you can confidently achieve and maintain high quality staff retention over the life of the framework and ensure that service users are supported by suitably trained staff? Your response should also address how you will motivate and train up existing staff.</p>	1%
<p>3.3 Medication and working with Local Health practitioners – Not lot 6.</p> <p>Please explain how you would train staff on different levels of medication support including the prompting or administration of medication and ensuring safety of medication support?</p>	1%
<b>4. Mobility and capacity building</b>	
<p>4.1 Please demonstrate how the tendered hourly rate you bid to the WLA:</p> <p>a) is feasible and achievable in delivering the service to the required standard and</p> <p>b) is financially, locally and socially sustainable over the life of the framework.</p> <p>The bidder when explaining in detail their hourly rate may refer to past performances or lessons from elsewhere to justify the answer.</p> <p>a) The bid should describe in detail assumptions made.</p> <p>b) The method statement should explain how these assumptions offer value for money.</p>	1%
<p>4.2 At PQQ stage you marked the wards where you will be able to deliver services at set intervals of the framework agreement, the outset, within 6 months, within the anniversary of the framework agreement etc.</p> <p>Please detail and provide an in depth mobilisation plan (showing timescales) and explain how your organisation will ensure you will deliver services in the wards highlighted at the PQQ stage in a timely manner?</p>	2%
<p>4.3 Out of Hours &amp; Rostering:</p> <p>Please demonstrate how your rosters are fair, flexible and cover emergencies; out of hours and 'unsociable' hours, including calls that are not rostered.</p> <p>Please provide an anonymised current roster to demonstrate the above and to ensure that the service requirement can meet demand.</p>	1%
<b>5. Business Continuity Planning</b>	
<p>5.1 Please explain what steps you will take to minimise the impact of major incidents or issues affecting the organisation both internal and external in the delivery of the services you are bidding for?</p> <p>Please do not attach business continuity policy</p> <p>Bidders should have clear plans about how their will manage any disruption to their business, with particular regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No access to offices e.g. terror alert and utility failure</li> <li>- Transport disruptions.</li> <li>- Extreme weather conditions</li> <li>- Public Health concerns e.g. flu epidemic</li> <li>- Staff shortage e.g. labour disputes, absenteeism around public/religious holidays and high levels of staff sickness</li> <li>- Information breach e.g. loss of confidential information, loss of roster</li> <li>- Threats to Financial stability/business risks</li> </ul> <p>N.B. IT failure to be addressed in section 6</p>	2%

<b>6. Information systems and their use for monitoring service provision</b>	
6.1 In the absence of ECMS (Electronic Call Monitoring System) in the service user home please describe what steps you would take to manage and monitor your staff and the service	2%
6.2 Please demonstrate how you will ensure commitment from all of your staff to use ECMS and what steps you will take in enforcing the use of this as part of the service provision.	1%
6.3 Please describe in detail how you will use ECMS to achieve the required compliance levels for this service: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missed calls</li> <li>• Double ups</li> <li>• Rostering of calls</li> <li>• Lost/stolen rosters</li> <li>• Out of hours</li> </ul>	2%
<b>7. Approach to partnership working with the Council and others</b>	
7.1 Give examples of how you will work creatively and innovatively with the Council and other agencies/stakeholders and families to better deliver the service.	1%
7.2 How will service users be made aware of your complaints procedure and how will you ensure that the outcomes of the complaints will be used to improve service delivery.	2%
<b>Section 2.4). Lot 4</b>	
<b>2.4.1. Approach to safeguarding and staff recruitment and training.</b>	
2.4.1. Please describe the recruitment and training processes you would follow to ensure that your services are delivered safely, in a dignified manner and action focused , with the appropriate skills and in accordance with the legislation?	2%
<b>2.4.2. Mobility and capacity building, and information systems and their use for monitoring service provision.</b>	
2.4.2. Please describe how you would organise your service and deliver services for the following types of support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Life skills</li> <li>• Outreach</li> <li>• Befriending</li> <li>• Support to promote social inclusion</li> <li>• Transition to adulthood</li> <li>• Working with families</li> <li>• Multiple/complex needs</li> </ul>	2%
<b>2.4.3. Meeting the needs of the individual and customer focus.</b>	
2.4.3. Please describe how you assess packages and then ensure successful delivery of an individualised service for disabled children, some of whom will have challenging behaviour and/or additional health needs or complex needs, e.g. epilepsy?	2%
Total	40%

The question % breakdown below will apply for all bidders bidding for Lot 5.

Section/Question - Lot 5	Q Weight(%)
<b>Section 1). Generic Questions</b>	%
<b>1. Meeting the needs of the individual (service user) and customer (local authority) focus</b>	



<p>1.1 Please describe how your organisation will assess and meet the care and support needs of individuals in a flexible way?</p> <p>Bidders response to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertaking an assessment of need and developing the individual care/support plan taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice?</li> <li>• Risk assessment (both in terms of the individual and the environment in which the care will be delivered)</li> <li>• Review of individual care and support needs</li> </ul>	<p>1%</p>
<p>1.2 Please describe how your Quality Assurance processes would address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respecting service users dignity and maintaining their overall health and well being</li> <li>• Identifying and responding to service users changing needs</li> <li>• Incorporating service user feedback including satisfaction surveys</li> <li>• Maintaining CQC registration and/or other accreditations</li> </ul> <p>N.B. your response to this question should demonstrate how your organisation will deliver an effective outcomes focused care service to vulnerable people with very different individual needs in accordance with the 28 CQC standards outlined in the Lot 1 specification.</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p>1.3 Please provide examples of how you will recruit locally and support the local community. e.g. investing in your staff to develop their skills and in doing this how you will address any equality and diversity considerations.</p>	<p>1%</p>
<p>1.4 How will your organisation deliver the required services taking into account the demographics and diverse nature of the population of the Purchasing Authorities? Bidders response should demonstrate a persons centred approach.</p>	<p>1%</p>
<p>1.5 How would you ensure that delivery of care is carried out in a flexible way taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice?</p> <p>In addition, 'Putting People First' requires local authorities to make personal budgets available for people with ongoing care and support needs as well as the more recent Social Care White Paper and 'Caring for our Future'- Reforming Care and Support, and the Draft Care and Support Bill which are all part of the wider transformation agenda for social care.</p> <p>Please demonstrate how Service Users can exercise choice and control over how their care is provided?</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p>1.6 How will you ensure service users will have the freedom to make their own choices and how will you promote independence within a safe environment.</p> <p>What interventions will you take to ensure this occurs?</p>	<p>2%</p>
<p><b>2. Approach to safeguarding, performance and safe environment</b></p>	
<p>Safeguarding 2.1 Please describe how your organisation will ensure that your staff and managers are able to recognise, identify and respond appropriately to safeguarding concerns and signs of potential abuse and exploitation in your day to day operation.</p>	<p>2%</p>

<p>2.2 How does your organisation manage safeguarding incidents and what are your formal procedures in reporting potential safeguarding concerns? - What pro-active measures can you demonstrate to evidence how you implement the safeguarding process in your day to day operation?</p>	2%
<p>Performance 2.3 Please demonstrate how would you identify and address performance issues such as e.g. missed calls/double ups where one carer has turned up, which could lead to safeguarding concerns.</p>	2%
<b>3. Approach to staff recruitment, retention and training</b>	
<p>Recruitment 3.1 Please explain how you will ensure the effective recruitment of local high quality care workers to meet service demands Your response should also include how would the local branch manager be supported in their role in light of changing service demands and staff requirements impacting service delivery?</p>	1%
<p>Retention and Training: 3.2 Please demonstrate how you can confidently achieve and maintain high quality staff retention over the life of the framework and ensure that service users are supported by suitably trained staff? Your response should also address how you will motivate and train up existing staff.</p>	1%
<p>3.3 Medication and working with Local Health practitioners – Not lot 6. Please explain how you would train staff on different levels of medication support including the prompting or administration of medication and ensuring safety of medication support?</p>	1%
<b>4. Mobility and capacity building</b>	
<p>4.1 Please demonstrate how the tendered hourly rate you bid to the WLA: a) is feasible and achievable in delivering the service to the required standard and b) is financially, locally and socially sustainable over the life of the framework.  The bidder when explaining in detail their hourly rate may refer to past performances or lessons from elsewhere to justify the answer. a) The bid should describe in detail assumptions made. b) The method statement should explain how these assumptions offer value for money.</p>	1%
<p>4.2 At PQQ stage you marked the wards where you will be able to deliver services at set intervals of the framework agreement, the outset, within 6 months, within the anniversary of the framework agreement etc.  Please detail and provide an in depth mobilisation plan (showing timescales) and explain how your organisation will ensure you will deliver services in the wards highlighted at the PQQ stage in a timely manner?</p>	2%
<p>4.3 Out of Hours &amp; Rostering: Please demonstrate how your rosters are fair, flexible and cover emergencies; out of hours and 'unsociable' hours, including calls that are not rostered. Please provide an anonymised current roster to demonstrate the above and to ensure that the service requirement can meet demand.</p>	1%
<b>5. Business Continuity Planning</b>	

5.1 Please explain what steps you will take to minimise the impact of major incidents or issues affecting the organisation both internal and external in the delivery of the services you are bidding for?  Please do not attach business continuity policy  Bidders should have clear plans about how their will manage any disruption to their business, with particular regard to: - No access to offices e.g. terror alert and utility failure - Transport disruptions. - Extreme weather conditions - Public Health concerns e.g. flu epidemic - Staff shortage e.g. labour disputes, absenteeism around public/religious holidays and high levels of staff sickness - Information breach e.g. loss of confidential information, loss of roster - Threats to Financial stability/business risks N.B. IT failure to be addressed in section 6	2%
<b>6. Information systems and their use for monitoring service provision</b>	
6.1 In the absence of ECMS (Electronic Call Monitoring System) in the service user home please describe what steps you would take to manage and monitor your staff and the service	2%
6.2 Please demonstrate how you will ensure commitment from all of your staff to use ECMS and what steps you will take in enforcing the use of this as part of the service provision.	1%
6.3 Please describe in detail how you will use ECMS to achieve the required compliance levels for this service: • Missed calls • Double ups • Rostering of calls • Lost/stolen rosters • Out of hours	2%
<b>7. Approach to partnership working with the Council and others</b>	
7.1 Give examples of how you will work creatively and innovatively with the Council and other agencies/stakeholders and families to better deliver the service..	1%
7.2 How will service users be made aware of your complaints procedure and how will you ensure that the outcomes of the complaints will be used to improve service delivery.	2%
<b>Section 2.5). Lot 5</b>	
<b>2.5.1 Mobility and capacity building and Approach to partnership working with the Council and others.</b>	
2.5.1.1 The service requires regular, informative communication between various organisations including the service user, carer, family, Purchasing Authority, Health Staff. How would you work with these partners to ensure an effective joint working approach to deliver the service?	2%
2.5.1.2 How would you set up and manage a new care package for a service user with complex needs at short notice (e.g. hospital discharge, placement breakdown)?	2%
<b>2.5.2 Approach to staff recruitment, retention and training and Meeting the needs of the individual and customer focus.</b>	
2.5.2.1 How do you presently ensure your staff are suitably skilled, competent and trained for delivering these enhanced support services?	2%
2.5.2.2 How would you ensure that the service you provide is person centred and is flexible to accept people with different needs?	2%
Total	40%

The question % breakdown below will apply for all bidders bidding for Lot 6.

Section/Question - Lot 6	Q Weight(%)
<b>Section 1). Generic Questions</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1. Meeting the needs of the individual (service user) and customer (local authority) focus</b>	
<p>1.1 Please describe how your organisation will assess and meet the care and support needs of individuals in a flexible way?</p> <p>Bidders response to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertaking an assessment of need and developing the individual care/support plan taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice?</li> <li>• Risk assessment (both in terms of the individual and the environment in which the care will be delivered)</li> <li>• Review of individual care and support needs</li> </ul>	1%
<p>1.2 Please describe how your Quality Assurance processes would address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respecting service users dignity and maintaining their overall health and well being</li> <li>• Identifying and responding to service users changing needs</li> <li>• Incorporating service user feedback including satisfaction surveys</li> <li>• Maintaining CQC registration and/or other accreditations</li> </ul> <p>N.B. your response to this question should demonstrate how your organisation will deliver an effective outcomes focused care service to vulnerable people with very different individual needs in accordance with the 28 CQC standards outlined in the Lot 1 specification.</p>	2%
<p>1.3 Please provide examples of how you will recruit locally and support the local community. e.g. investing in your staff to develop their skills and in doing this how you will address any equality and diversity considerations.</p>	1%
<p>1.4 How will your organisation deliver the required services taking into account the demographics and diverse nature of the population of the Purchasing Authorities? Bidders response should demonstrate a persons centred approach.</p>	1%
<p>1.5 How would you ensure that delivery of care is carried out in a flexible way taking into account the use of personal budgets and service user choice?</p> <p>In addition, 'Putting People First' requires local authorities to make personal budgets available for people with ongoing care and support needs as well as the more recent Social Care White Paper and 'Caring for our Future' - Reforming Care and Support, and the Draft Care and Support Bill which are all part of the wider transformation agenda for social care.</p> <p>Please demonstrate how Service Users can exercise choice and control over how their care is provided?</p>	2%
<p>1.6 How will you ensure service users will have the freedom to make their own choices and how will you promote independence within a safe environment.</p> <p>What interventions will you take to ensure this occurs?</p>	2%
<b>2. Approach to safeguarding, performance and safe environment</b>	
<p>Safeguarding</p> <p>2.1 Please describe how your organisation will ensure that your staff and managers are able to recognise, identify and respond appropriately to safeguarding concerns and signs of potential</p>	2%

abuse and exploitation in your day to day operation.	
2.2 How does your organisation manage safeguarding incidents and what are your formal procedures in reporting potential safeguarding concerns? - What pro-active measures can you demonstrate to evidence how you implement the safeguarding process in your day to day operation?	2%
Performance 2.3 Please demonstrate how would you identify and address performance issues such as e.g. missed calls/double ups where one carer has turned up, which could lead to safeguarding concerns.	2%
<b>3. Approach to staff recruitment, retention and training</b>	
Recruitment 3.1 Please explain how you will ensure the effective recruitment of local high quality care workers to meet service demands Your response should also include how would the local branch manager be supported in their role in light of changing service demands and staff requirements impacting service delivery?	1%
Retention and Training: 3.2 Please demonstrate how you can confidently achieve and maintain high quality staff retention over the life of the framework and ensure that service users are supported by suitably trained staff? Your response should also address how you will motivate and train up existing staff.	0%
3.3 Medication and working with Local Health practitioners – Not lot 6. Please explain how you would train staff on different levels of medication support including the prompting or administration of medication and ensuring safety of medication support?	1%
<b>4. Mobility and capacity building</b>	
4.1 Please demonstrate how the tendered hourly rate you bid to the WLA: a) is feasible and achievable in delivering the service to the required standard and b) is financially, locally and socially sustainable over the life of the framework.  The bidder when explaining in detail their hourly rate may refer to past performances or lessons from elsewhere to justify the answer. a) The bid should describe in detail assumptions made. b) The method statement should explain how these assumptions offer value for money.	1%
4.2 At PQQ stage you marked the wards where you will be able to deliver services at set intervals of the framework agreement, the outset, within 6 months, within the anniversary of the framework agreement etc.  Please detail and provide an in depth mobilisation plan (showing timescales) and explain how your organisation will ensure you will deliver services in the wards highlighted at the PQQ stage in a timely manner?	2%
4.3 Out of Hours & Rostering: Please demonstrate how your rosters are fair, flexible and cover emergencies; out of hours and 'unsociable' hours, including calls that are not rostered. Please provide an anonymised current roster to demonstrate the above and to ensure that the service requirement can meet demand.	1%
<b>5. Business Continuity Planning</b>	
5.1 Please explain what steps you will take to minimise the impact of major incidents or issues affecting the organisation both internal and external in the delivery of the services you are bidding for?  Please do not attach business continuity policy  Bidders should have clear plans about how their will manage any disruption to their business, with particular regard to: - No access to offices e.g. terror alert and utility failure	2%


- Transport disruptions. - Extreme weather conditions - Public Health concerns e.g. flu epidemic - Staff shortage e.g. labour disputes, absenteeism around public/religious holidays and high levels of staff sickness - Information breach e.g. loss of confidential information, loss of roster - Threats to Financial stability/business risks N.B. IT failure to be addressed in section 6	
<b>6. Information systems and their use for monitoring service provision</b>	
6.1 In the absence of ECMS (Electronic Call Monitoring System) in the service user home please describe what steps you would take to manage and monitor your staff and the service	2%
6.2 Please demonstrate how you will ensure commitment from all of your staff to use ECMS and what steps you will take in enforcing the use of this as part of the service provision.	1%
6.3 Please describe in detail how you will use ECMS to achieve the required compliance levels for this service: • Missed calls • Double ups • Rostering of calls • Lost/stolen rosters • Out of hours	2%
<b>7. Approach to partnership working with the Council and others</b>	
7.1 Give examples of how you will work creatively and innovatively with the Council and other agencies/stakeholders and families to better deliver the service.	1%
7.2 How will service users be made aware of your complaints procedure and how will you ensure that the outcomes of the complaints will be used to improve service delivery.	2%
<b>Section 2.6). Lot 6</b>	
<b>2.6.1. Meeting the needs of the individual and customer focus.</b>	
2.6.1.1 Please explain how you will demonstrate choice and control by identifying outcomes and tailoring the support when working with individuals in cross tenure services.	3%
2.6.1.2 Please explain how your organisation would motivate individuals and manage their expectations to reduce their reliance on floating support services in a timely and positive way?	2%
2.6.1.3 Please describe how your organisation will work with individuals to identify their needs, and to ensure that service users are involved in the delivery of the services which demonstrates choice and control?	2%
<b>2.6.2. Approach to staff recruitment, retention and training</b>	
2.6.2. Please give details of the staffing structure your organisation will adopt to deliver high quality floating support services. How will you recruit, train and retain staff with the appropriate skills and qualities to deliver the best possible outcomes for service users?	2%
Total	40%

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



 <p><b>Brent</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Cabinet</b> 16 June 2014</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Report from the Strategic Director of Adult Social Services</b></p>
<p>For Action <span style="float: right;">Wards affected: ALL</span></p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Authority to award an Advocacy Services Contract</b></p>	

## 1.0 Summary

In accordance with Contract Standing Orders 88 this report seeks Cabinet authority to award a 2 + 1 year contract for Advocacy Services for Safeguarding, Mental Health, Learning Disabilities, Older People with Physical Disabilities and Younger People with Physical Disabilities. The report summarises the process undertaken in tendering this contract and following completion of the evaluation of the tender, recommends to whom the contract should be awarded.

## 2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That Members award a contract to Voiceability Limited as lead organisation for a consortium for Advocacy Services for Safeguarding Mental Health, Learning Disabilities, Older People with Physical Disabilities and Younger People with Physical Disabilities for a term of 2 years with a possible extension of 1 year, starting on 1 July 2014.
- 2.2 That Members note the reasons (detailed in paragraph 3.7) for the further extension to the existing contracts from their current expiry date of 31<sup>st</sup> May 2014 to the commencement date of the contract detailed in Recommendation 2.1 and note the legal advice (detailed in paragraph 5.3) as to the the use of delegated powers to effect such extension.

## 3.0 Detail

## **Background**

- 3.1 Adult Social Care is committed to providing an independent and high quality Advocacy service that works in partnership with service users and helps them to access the support that other people already access to lead more independent and inclusive lives and to be involved in decisions about their future.
- 3.2 The service, which is currently delivered through four separate contracts, allows the most vulnerable people in Brent to have control over the care and support and play an important part in helping them make choices that might otherwise be made by other people.
- 3.3 The new contract will ensure the client groups set out below continue to have a say in their own lives. It will also support them to speak up for themselves and, where appropriate, provide them a representative to ensure they maintain or achieve their rights as a citizen. The client groups are:
- all Safeguarding clients (SG) to ensure Health Protection,
  - Older People with Physical Disabilities (OPPD),
  - Young People with Physical Disabilities, aged 14 to 25 (YPPD),
  - Adults with Mental Health needs (MH), and;
  - Adults with a Learning Disabilities (LD).
- 3.4 More specifically, the client groups will receive crisis advocacy (for example when an advocate is likely to support someone at a benefit tribunal, or to assist someone who has bailiffs coming round or who has been threatened with eviction), self advocacy (where individuals are made aware of their rights and responsibilities allowing them to speak-up for their rights, and make choices and decisions that affect their lives), and citizen advocacy (where trained volunteers offer information and support their clients with back-up and supervision from an advocacy co-ordinator).
- 3.5 Through the single contract the service will be developed to ensure:
- the needs of the The Care Act 2014 (the “Care Act”), Clause 67-68, which places a duty on local authorities to arrange an independent advocate to be available to facilitate the involvement of an adult or carer who is the subject of an assessment, care or support planning or review, are met by April 2015;
  - the establishment of an independent, confidential, high quality professional advocacy service that is independent of those commissioned or provided by health or social care services;
  - provision of one to one support that meets the needs of the specified users including their ability, disability, race, culture, sexuality, age, gender and treat them with respect, courtesy and dignity;
  - support for people to identify and represent their own concerns directly to all relevant bodies. Self advocacy is the preferred option and the service should aim to support this wherever possible;
  - raised awareness to the providers and commissioners about particular issues faced by users of the independent professional advocacy service, including the concerns of specific users who might be finding it difficult to engage with services and

- the provision of information on local services and signposting them to other services when these are more appropriate for advocacy service users.

### ***The tender process***

- 3.6 In advance of the existing contract end dates the Executive, at its 9th December 2013 meeting, approved the procurement of a new 2+1 year Advocacy contract which would seek to select a sole provider with or without sub-contracting arrangements or a lead consortium member to deliver Advocacy services.
- 3.7 In accordance with the 9th December 2013 Executive report, expressions of interest were requested from interested parties. The 23 parties that submitted an expression of interest are listed within Appendix B. These parties then received the Invitation to Tender. One consortium bid was received, however, it failed a number of mandatory assessments (a number of essential documents were not submitted by the consortium), which meant that the procurement process had to be started again and created the delay which has led to the need for a further extension of the current contracts.
- 3.8 The new procurement followed the same single stage open tender process and was re-advertised on the Council's website and the local press. Following the issue of the Invitation to Tender, one tender response was received on time from Voiceability Limited as the lead consortium organisation with Brent Mencap and Age UK Brent as its members. All three organisations had individually expressed an interest but decided to bid together as a consortium.
- 3.9 A panel consisting of representation from Adult Social Services together with input from Finance, Health and Safety, Procurement and Service Users was established to undertake the evaluation of the single tender response in accordance with the evaluation methodology issued within the Invitation to Tender (ITT) pack.

### ***The evaluation process***

- 3.10 The evaluation process consisted of the following stages:
- Stage 1 - Preliminary compliance checks (for all consortium members)  
 Stage 2 - Scoring of bidders answers to Method Statement and Cost questions (lead consortium member only)
- 3.11 All consortium members passed Stage 1, meeting the Council's standard financial, technical and organisational requirements. Stage 2 scored answers were evaluated using the evaluation criteria and weightings approved by the Executive on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2013. The score parameters shown in table 1 below were used to evaluate the quality criteria:

Assessment	Score
------------	-------

Assessment	Score
Deficient – Response to the question significantly deficient or no response received.	0
Limited – Limited information provided, or a response that is inadequate or only partially addresses the question.	1
Acceptable - An acceptable response in terms of the level of detail, accuracy and relevance.	2
Comprehensive – A comprehensive response in terms of detail and relevance.	3
Superior – As Comprehensive but to a significantly better degree and demonstrating best practice.	4

3.12 The quality score consisted of 50% of the evaluation weighting. The consortium lead received a total panel score of 36.8%. No individual score score was less than 1.

3.13 With only one tender response the proportional scoring could not be applied to the costs where the lowest bid would have received the highest score out of the 50% evaluation weighting. The tender was however £4281 less than the combined contract price for the four existing contracts.

3.14 Given that Officers have no concerns as to the quality aspects of the tender received and that the tender price is considered reasonable, Officers recommend the award of the Contract to Voiceability Limited as lead organisation of a consortium consisting of itself, Brent Mencap and Age UK Brent. Subject to Cabinet approval, Officers would intend to proceed with award as soon as possible with the contract to commence on 1 July 2014.

### **Benefits**

3.15 As stated in paragraph 3.5, under the needs of the Care Act, from April 2015 local authorities will have a duty to provide independent advocacy services. In particular these should be locally available, involve service users in key processes, make information available to all and signpost people to other sources of advice. The new contract supports the implementation of this duty and brings with it the following benefits:

- The service will be independent of those commissioned or provided by health or social care services as well as being confidential and of a high quality.
- As a local provider, the contractor (and it's consortia members) are best placed to provide Advocacy local services and signposting them to others, once again locally, when these are more appropriate.

- One to one support, that meets the individual needs of the service users with respect, courtesy and dignity provided. The support includes consideration of service user's ability, disability, race, culture, sexuality, age and gender.
- Individuals will be supported to identify and represent their own concerns directly to all relevant bodies. Self advocacy is the preferred option and the service will aim to support this wherever possible.
- It will provide short term, issue based and 'crisis' advocacy when significant decisions are needed urgently, for example in Safeguarding Adult cases.
- Awareness about particular issues faced by users of the independent professional advocacy service, including the concerns of specific users who might be finding it difficult to engage with services, will be effectively managed by the provider and commissioner.

3.16 Contract administration will be reduced by moving to a single agreement and service access will become more simplified and consistent.

### ***Existing Contracts***

3.17 Members were advised in the report to the Executive of 9<sup>th</sup> December 2013 that existing contracts were to be extended to 1 June 2014 at a cost not exceeding £29,054. In view of the issue of non-compliance detailed in paragraph 3.7 and the consequent delay to the procurement process, it has been necessary for the Strategic Director of Adults to exercise delegated powers to extend existing contracts beyond 1 June 2014 to 1 July 2014 at a cost not exceeding £6000 to ensure the expiry of existing contracts does not occur before the commencement of the new contract.

## **4.0 Financial Implications**

4.1 It is anticipated that usage during the initial months of the contract will be limited due to the contract being embedded within the service. This reduced initial take up will allow the budget to fund the marginal residual costs of the current Advocacy Contract extensions referenced to within paragraph 3.7.

4.2 The proposed 3 year contract cost projection was £395,700 (£131,900 per annum) The tender price is £391,419 representing a £4281 reduction over the life of the contract.

4.3 The existing Adults annual Advocacy budget of £131,900 (MC50) will fund the contract over the next three years.

4.4 In order to ensure best value throughout the life of the contracts the fees will be paid on a call off basis, ie only those hours used will be paid for, and this will be carefully monitored through the contract management process.

- 4.5 The usage of this service could change due to the implementation of the Care Act, and due to the call off basis of the contract there is a risk of spending more than the agreed contract value. There is currently uncertainty on the increase in demand for advocacy due to the implementation of the Care Act.
- 4.6 However, the contract costs will be monitored closely as the Care Act progresses, and this risk will be managed by the department through the Care Act Implementation project which is monitoring all of the additional costs and pressures created by the Care Act. The department will seek to take actions to mitigate additional costs, should they materialise, so that they are contained within the overall budget envelope. For example, through the ongoing contract management of this contract the department will ensure this service is focused on providing advocacy, as defined in the specification, and there is no displacement from other related services.

## **5.0 Legal Implications**

- 5.1 The estimated value of the contract over its term (including possible extensions) is in excess of £250k. As such the contract is a High Value contract for the purposes of Council Contract Standing Orders and Financial Regulations and thus Cabinet authority is required to award the contract.
- 5.2 The estimated value of the contract is also in excess of the EU threshold for Services under the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (the “EU Regulations”). Advocacy services are however classed as Part B services and thus are subject only to partial application of the EU Regulations, including:
- (i). Non-discrimination in the technical specification.
  - (ii). Notification of the contract award to the EU Publications Office.

The contract is not therefore subject to, for example, a requirement for a standstill period to be observed.

- 5.3 As indicated in paragraph 3.17, it has been necessary to further extend the existing contracts from 1 June 2014 to 1 July 2014 pending the decision of the Cabinet with regard to the award of the contract. This short extension of the contracts has been effected by the Strategic Director of Adults using powers delegated to relevant Officers pursuant to paragraph 3 b) of the table at paragraph 2.5 of Part 4 of the Constitution. Subject to the decision of the Cabinet, Officers intend to proceed to contract. Officers will not however be able to contract until the expiry of any call-in period following the Cabinet meeting.
- 5.4 As one of the existing providers has indicated that none of its staff will transfer pursuant to the Transfer of Employment (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (“TUPE”) and other existing providers are members of the consortium led by Voiceability Limited, there are no implications relating to TUPE.

## **6.0 Diversity Implications**

- 6.1 The proposed contract will require the provider to deliver services which are:
- culturally sensitive by providing cultural awareness training for all staff, matching specific language requirements where possible and recruiting a local workforce which reflects the communities of Brent;
  - able to provide support and advice to service users with disabilities, and young people with disabilities and older people; and
  - able to provide training for all staff in areas that will raise awareness of issues faced by vulnerable people from different ethnic groups.
- 6.2 The provider will be monitored to ensure they are complying with these requirements through checking of their records, regular review of services provided to individual service users where feedback will be sought from service users, monthly monitoring meetings and provision of quarterly performance information to the Council.
- 6.3 In view of the fact that this procurement represents a change to the model of service delivery, it is necessary for the Cabinet as decision-making body to consider the equalities implications. An equalities analysis was completed when approval to procure was sought in December 2013 (see Appendix A) in accordance with the Equality Act 2010, and officers believe that there are no adverse diversity implications.

## **7.0 Staffing Implications**

- 7.1 The services that are to be provided under the new contract are currently provided by external contractors. Under any new contract the service will be provided by external contractors and there are no direct implications for Council staff arising from tendering a contract of this type
- 7.2 There are no TUPE implications arising from the award of the Contract.

## **8.0 Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012**

- 8.1 The Council is under a duty pursuant to the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 (the "Social Value Act") to consider how the services being procured might be structured to improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of its area.
- 8.2 As the market for Advocacy services is highly specialised and limited, the opportunities available to the Authority in terms of the requirements of the Social Value Act were narrow. However, the proposed contract will expand existing Advocacy support to a wider group of residents to improve their overall social and economic well-being means that the actual subject-matter of the contract is in fact delivering the aims set out in the Act.

## **Background Papers**

Report to Executive of 9 December 2013

The Care Act 2014: Independent Advocacy Support.

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2014/23/part/1/crossheading/independent-advocacy-support/enacted>

## **Contact Officers**

Jas Kothiria  
Senior Category Manager  
Adult Social Care  
Tel 020 8937 1170  
Email [jas.kothiria@brent.gov.uk](mailto:jas.kothiria@brent.gov.uk)

Amy Jones  
Head of Service Commissioning and Quality  
Adults Social Care  
Tel 020 8937 4061  
Email [amy.jones@brent.gov.uk](mailto:amy.jones@brent.gov.uk)

**PHIL PORTER**  
**Strategic Director Adult Social Services**



## Appendix A: Equalities Impact Assessment

<b>Department: Adult Social Care</b>	<b>Person Responsible: Beverleigh Forbes</b>
Service Area: Integrated Commissioning	Timescale for Equality Impact Assessment :
Date: 8 <sup>th</sup> October 2013	Completion date: 8 <sup>th</sup> October 2013
Name of service/policy: Advocacy Services	Is the service/policy/procedure/project etc: New <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Old
Predictive <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Retrospective <input type="checkbox"/>	Adverse impact <input type="checkbox"/> Not found <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Found <input type="checkbox"/> Service/policy/procedure/project etc, amended to stop or reduce adverse impact Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there likely to be a differential impact on any group? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Please state below:
1. Grounds of race: Ethnicity, nationality or national origin e.g. people of different ethnic backgrounds including Gypsies and Travellers and Refugees/ Asylum Seekers Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. Grounds of gender: Sex, marital status, transgendered people and people with caring responsibilities Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Grounds of disability: Physical or sensory impairment, mental disability or learning disability Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4. Grounds of faith or belief: Religion/faith including people who do not have a religion Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Grounds of sexual orientation: Lesbian, Gay and bisexual Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6. Grounds of age: Older people, children and young People Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Consultation conducted - Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	

Person responsible for arranging the review: Beverleigh Forbes	Person responsible for publishing results of Equality Impact Assessment: Beverleigh Forbes
Person responsible for monitoring: Steven Forbes	Date results due to be published and where: Published in an appendix to Executive report on the XX December 2013 on Brent Council's website
Signed:	Date: 8 <sup>th</sup> October 2013

Please note that you must complete this form if you are undertaking a formal Impact Needs/Requirement Assessment. You may also wish to use this form for guidance to undertake an initial assessment, please indicate.

**1. What is the service/policy/procedure/project etc to be assessed?**

New Advocacy services contract

**2. Briefly describe the aim of the service/policy etc? What needs or duties is it designed to meet? How does it differ from any existing services/ policies etc in this area**

The Putting People First cross Government concordat published in 2007 set out the vision for Transforming Adult Social Care and stressed the importance of vulnerable people having control over the care and support they received. In order for this to happen advocacy services are required, and play an important part in helping people make choices for themselves that might otherwise be made for them by other people.

The council currently has 4 suppliers providing Advocacy support across Safeguarding, and to Adults with Mental Health Needs, Adults with Learning Disabilities and Older People with Physical Disabilities. The single contract arising from the proposed procurement will result in an expansion of these services to include Younger People with Physical Disabilities.

In view of the fact that this contract represents a change to the existing model of delivery the Executive need to consider equality implications.

**3. Are the aims consistent with the council's Comprehensive Equality Policy?**

Yes, implementing the service will have a positive impact on all service users.

**4. Is there any evidence to suggest that this could affect some groups of people? Is there an adverse impact around race/gender/disability/faith/sexual orientation/health etc? What are the reasons for this adverse impact?**

No there is no evidence that some groups will be affected differentially. There will be improved access to services for all people requiring advocacy services regardless of race/gender/disability/faith/sexual orientation/health. Therefore, no adverse impacts have been identified for any groups. Commissioning decisions were made through reviewing requirements with local stakeholders and service users. The reviews will consider current service use and future demand.

**5. Please describe the evidence you have used to make your judgement. What existing data for example (qualitative or quantitative) have you used to form your judgement? Please supply us with the evidence you used to make you judgement separately (by race, gender and disability etc).**

Contractors provide quarterly monitoring information on their performance which includes detailed enough equality information to allow us to make such judgement. For evidence see



document attached.

**6. Are there any unmet needs/requirements that can be identified that affect specific groups? (Please refer to provisions of the Disability Discrimination Act and the regulations on sexual orientation and faith, Age regulations/legislation if applicable)**

None have been identified

**7. Have you consulted externally as part of your assessment? Who have you consulted with? What methods did you use? What have you done with the results i.e. how do you intend to use the information gathered as part of the consultation?**

The existing contracted service involves user consultation. The comments of these users are included in the contractors' service reviews and subsequent service improvements'

The views of service users will directly impact on the service specifications and will contribute to the selection process for organisations.

**8. Have you published the results of the consultation, if so where?**

The contractors service reviews outcomes are included in their annual reports which are published on their websites.

**9. Is there a public concern (in the media etc) that this function or policy is being operated in a discriminatory manner?**

The council is not aware of a public concern about the Advocacy services tender being operated in a discriminatory manner however there is general concern that the impact of financial cuts on services for vulnerable people should be subject to an Impact Assessment. Some small organisations may be concerned about their ability to respond to the tender invitation.

**10. If in your judgement, the proposed service/policy etc does have an adverse impact, can that impact be justified? You need to think about whether the proposed service/policy etc will have a positive or negative effect on the promotion of equality of opportunity, if it will help eliminate discrimination in any way, or encourage or hinder community relations.**

Neutral impact

**11. If the impact cannot be justified, how do you intend to deal with it?**

N/A

**12. What can be done to improve access to/take up of services?**

The service will be universally accessible service, for all people who require Advocacy services. If Executive approve the procurement we will a seek provider(s) who will put marketing and publicity mechanisms in place to ensure the service is adequately advertised and promoted, and that as many people as possible are aware of the Advocacy Services at the first point of contact

**13. What is the justification for taking these measures?**

A change in the grant funding regime meant that funded providers could no longer re-apply for the stated funding and coupled with the change in reduction procurement thresholds, this tendering exercise is required to take place.

14. Please provide us with separate evidence of how you intend to monitor in the future. Please give the name of the person who will be responsible for this on the front page.

**Contracts:**

Monitoring will be based on how well service organisations meet the outcomes stated in the service specification. Service users will have the opportunity to specify their own desired outcomes which will be monitored. On-going monitoring information is received by the ASC Commissioning Unit quarterly from organisations; this is reviewed and discussed as appropriate with a particular emphasis on any change in the profile of services users.

KPIs will capture direct/indirect activity, with breakdown such as:

Ethnicity  
Age  
Gender  
Disability  
Sexual orientation  
Marriage and civil partnership  
Faith and belief  
Transgender  
Pregnancy and maternity  
Service specific indicators

**Impact of the procurement:**

Monitoring of the impact of the procurement on organisations will take place prior to awarding a contract. The service will be formally monitored by the Council's contract managers on a quarterly basis.

**15. What are your recommendations based on the conclusions and comments of this assessment?**

No adverse impacts have been identified into any groups.

The Advocacy service would be regularly monitored, through regular and on-going consultation and the quarterly monitoring meetings and reviews to ensure that any future/possible adverse impacts are avoided.

The outcome monitoring should also be undertaken to ensure that all services deliver high quality services to the community

**Should you:**

**1. Take any immediate action?**

Ensure that information for tenderers includes clear instructions on financial requirements, consortia arrangements and ensure that providers are able to plan for the future in relation to the duration of the contract and for the Council to consider officer delegation functions.

**2. Develop equality objectives and targets based on the conclusions?**

It is unlikely specific targets will be identified, services to be procured in future will be based on outcomes. All successful provider will need to evidence that the required outcomes can be met for all groups.

**3. Carry out further research?**

Not at this time

**16. If equality objectives and targets need to be developed, please list them here.**

N/A

**17. What will your resource allocation for action comprise of?**

The funding for this service has been allocated through the Adult Social Care Unit

If you need more space for any of your answers please continue on a separate sheet

Signed by the manager undertaking the assessment:

Full name (in capitals please):  
Beverleigh Forbes

Date: 24<sup>th</sup> October 2013

Service Area and position in the council:

Integrated Commissioner, Adult Social Care

Details of others involved in the assessment - auditing team/peer review:

Once you have completed this form, please take a copy and send it to: **The Corporate Diversity Team, Civic Centre**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **ADVOCACY AWARD REPORT**

### **APPENDIX B - BIDDER LIST**

- Advocacy West Midlands
- Advocate for Mental Health
- Age Concern Brent
- Barnados
- Brent Centre for Young People
- Brent Mencap
- Browncross Healthcare Limited
- Carers Federation
- Community Intermediate Services Ltd
- DAII
- Elders Voice
- Ernst & Young
- Expert Outcomes Assessment Services
- Hammersmith and Fulham Mind
- Mosaic Advocacy Centre C.I.C
- NYAS
- Penderels
- PohWer
- Quality of Life Homecare
- Rethink
- Royal Association for Deaf People
- Together Working For Wellbeing
- Voiceability - Speaking Up

This page is intentionally left blank





**Cabinet**  
16 June 2014

## **Report from the Strategic Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods**

For Action

Wards Affected: ALL

### **Safer Lorry Scheme**

#### **1.0 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Brent Council has a long and successful track record of reducing accidents in Brent's roads. Recent analysis has shown that HGVs are involved in a significant proportion of cyclist and pedestrian accidents and this report seeks approval to implement a London wide, minimum standard of safety features on all HGVs over 3.5 tonnes.

#### **2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 The Cabinet are asked to agree to the principle of creating a new pan-London traffic order requiring minimum safety features for all HGVs over 3.5 tonnes.
- 2.2 The Cabinet are asked agree to delegate authority to London Council's Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) to exercise the functions set out in paragraph 3.13.

#### **3.0 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Brent Council has a long and successful history of reducing accidents in the borough. As part of this, the Council has a continual review of what can be done to further reduce accidents. Across London, the number of recent cyclist and pedestrian deaths has prompted questions about what more could be done to reduce the likelihood of such collisions in the future. A significant and disproportionate number of collisions involve heavy goods vehicles (HGVs), some of which are exempt from current national and European regulations on fitting safety features such as side guards and special proximity mirrors. In recognition of this, Brent Council has proactively worked with TfL to ensure that Conway Aecom (the highway contractor) and Veolia (public realm) have implemented cutting edge safety technology on its vehicles and extensive driver training.
- 3.2 To understand the position on HGV collisions better, Transport for London (TfL) commissioned the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) to prepare a report examining, quantifying and analysing the incidence of fatal or serious injury cyclist and pedestrian accidents and to consider what measures might be taken to reduce the number of such

accidents. TRL's report indicated that between 2008 and 2012, HGVs were involved in 53% of London cyclist deaths despite making up only approximately 4% of all traffic. Provisional data states that in 2013 HGVs were involved in 9 out of 14 cyclist (64%) and 13 out of 65 pedestrian (20%) deaths in London. This has prompted strong debate about what more could be done to reduce the occurrence of serious injuries and deaths affecting vulnerable road users in the future.

- 3.3 TRL has estimated that a maximum of 7.2 killed and seriously injured (2.4 fatal collisions and 4.8 serious injuries to cyclist and pedestrians) could be prevented each year by the fitting of additional safety equipment such as side guards and additional mirrors. Revised figures accounting for driver behaviour in collisions have reduced this figure to 1.4 fatal collisions and 1.0 serious injury per year; a smaller but still very significant number considering the personal and economic cost of a serious or fatal collision.
- 3.4 On 20 January 2014, TfL published a feasibility study entitled 'Safer Lorry Scheme, The Way Forward'. The findings of this report contained much of the detailed analysis undertaken by TRL into road casualties associated with HGVs which are exempt from having side guard rails and specific types of mirrors fitted. TfL's feasibility study set out three options for delivering the Mayor of London's proposal to ban the most dangerous vehicles from the capital. The options considered were:
- a) TfL to introduce a Road User Charging Scheme Order for a Safer Lorry Charge enforced through Automatic Number Plate Reader cameras (ANPR); i.e. a road user charging scheme where only HGVs meeting required safety standards can travel in London free of charge. The Department of Transport (DfT) would need to approve signage changes.
  - b) TfL to work with London Councils to make a "Pan-London" Traffic Regulation Order(s) (TRO) to prohibit HGVs not meeting required safety standards from using London's roads. This could be enforced by Penalty Charge Notice using CCTV systems and on-street traffic enforcement officers. DfT would have to approve changes to signage and moving traffic legislation.
  - c) Introduce a hybrid approach adopting option b) and developing option a) in parallel.
- 3.5 The report recommended option b) as achieving the highest cost benefit ratio: A pan-London ban on all HGVs over 3.5 tonnes that are not compliant with the required safety standards for driving on London's roads. The safety standards proposed are:
- Class V and VI mirrors irrespective of current exemptions
  - Side guards for all 'relevant' vehicle types, irrespective of current exemptions.
- 3.6 The ban on vehicles over 3.5 tonnes will include anything heavier than a 'Light Goods Vehicle' including large 'Luton-type' vans through to the biggest multi-axle articulated lorries. The majority of vehicles have this basic safety equipment fitted as standard. However, for those that don't the cost of retro-fitting is relatively inexpensive, especially when compared to typical vehicle purchase and operating costs. A close proximity mirror costs around £300 and side guards around £500, including installation.
- 3.7 On 13 March 2014, these proposals were considered and approved by the London Council's TEC. They also noted the difficulties in asking the 32 councils and TfL to individually develop, consult and implement the necessary traffic orders. TfL has the power

to make traffic orders which apply to the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). Local authorities have the power to make traffic orders affecting roads within their local authority area with the exception of the TLRN and only on trunk roads with the consent of the DfT.

- 3.8 London Councils through TEC has the powers at present on behalf of 32 of the London local authorities and TfL to operate and enforce the London Lorry Control Scheme (“LLCS”) introduced in 1985 by the Greater London (Restriction of Goods Vehicles) Traffic Order 1985 as amended (the 1985 Order). With the exception of the London Borough of Barnet, this order operates and is enforceable by TEC on identified routes on the whole London road network (including on the TLRN) during specified periods and the restrictions apply to vehicles over 18 tonnes.
- 3.9 The TfL Safer Lorry Scheme Proposal is more ambitious than the existing LLCS as restrictions would extend to all vehicles over 3.5 tonnes, 24 hours a day 7 days a week, over the whole of the Greater London area.
- 3.10 The advice to TEC was that the most effective means for the London local authorities to support the TfL proposal is to enable TEC to make a pan-London road traffic order on behalf of the London local authorities and to enforce that order consistently on their behalf across London in much the same way as it operates and enforces the LLCS (although it is not proposed to operate a permit scheme in this case).
- 3.11 However, there is some uncertainty as to whether TEC currently has the delegated authority from the London local authorities to make such an order under the TEC Governing Agreement (which sets out the framework for TEC’s governance and operation). To avoid any such uncertainty, this report seeks approval to delegate authority to the TEC to make the necessary pan-London traffic order(s) to bring into effect the Safer Lorry Scheme.
- 3.12 TEC will carry out a pan-London consultation in late June/July and Brent officers will ensure that key local stakeholders such as Brent Cyclists are made aware of the consultation. Questions and concerns from local authorities can be addressed and resolved during the consultation stage.
- 3.13 Finally, the TEC report set out advice from Leading Counsel and Councils were asked to delegate to TEC the exercise of the following functions in the following terms:

*To delegate authority to:*

*Make pan-London traffic order(s) under section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, and all other enabling powers, where it is in the collective interests of the Participating Authorities, and TfL as relevant, such decision to be taken only after consultation with each of them. To provide for the implementation and enforcement of any order(s) so made including but not limited to the monitoring of the effectiveness of the said implementation and enforcement, the examination of vehicles, the issue of permits including the consideration of appeals arising from the refusal or conditioning of any such permits, the erection of adequate signs, liaison with the police, the prosecution of offences arising under such order(s) and any amendments approved from time to time, the updating of technical information on new vehicle designs, the taking of all necessary steps to promote and make amending, supplementary and other variation orders affecting the primary order(s) and the determination and implementation of policy and the giving of advice.*

#### **4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 There are no financial implications at this stage, and any future work undertaken will be carried out with the understanding that there will be no net costs for Brent Council.

#### **5.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 In essence, the proposal is that a new London-wide traffic order(s) is made which will require all vehicles over 3.5 tones to have side guards and safety mirrors when driving in London to help reduce the tragic number of deaths and injuries resulting from collisions between vulnerable road users and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs).

5.2 Following detailed discussion and legal advice, London Councils and TfL officers agreed that the best way to promote the London wide traffic order(s) is through TEC (London Councils' Transport and Environmental Committee), similar to the way TEC is responsible for the existing London Lorry Control Scheme. There was some uncertainty as to whether TEC's existing delegated authority is sufficient to promote the required new order(s), so the recommendation to the Joint Committee of the TEC on 13 March 2014 was to seek an express delegation to the TEC from each individual local authority and this recommendation was agreed by the TEC. London Councils was advised by Leading Counsel that such delegation can be made in writing by individual local authorities without having to prepare a formal Deed of Variation to the current TEC Governing Agreement. Under the Council's Constitution, such a delegation must be made by the Cabinet.

5.3 The proposed delegation from the Council to the Joint Committee of the TEC relates to the Council's functions under section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 for the purpose of making and enforcing pan-London traffic orders, which includes the power to impose safety and environmental restrictions.

5.4 The proposed delegation being sought from each London local authority is intended to allow sufficient flexibility for TEC to develop the best approach with TfL and London boroughs through the planned consultations. London Councils have indicated that the proposed TEC powers to promote pan-London traffic orders of this nature will be exercised very rarely and will only be used following proper consultation with London boroughs and subsequent TEC authority.

5.5 The remaining legal implications are set out in the body of this report.

#### **6.0 DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 No diversity issues have been identified and final impact assessments will be carried out on all proposals and any equalities implications will be reported to TEC in July with any detailed recommendations.

#### **7.0 STAFFING / ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 None identified.

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

Short Title of Document	Date	File Location
London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee: Revised Lorry Control Initiatives for Improved Road User Safety	February 2013	<a href="http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/committees/agenda.htm?pk_agenda_items=5551">http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/committees/agenda.htm?pk_agenda_items=5551</a>
Safer Lorry Scheme' The Way Forward'	January 2014	<a href="#">Safer Lorry Scheme link</a>


## CONTACT OFFICERS

Jenny Isaac, Operational Director Neighbourhoods

**Sue Harper**

**Strategic Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods**

This page is intentionally left blank

 <p><b>Brent</b></p>	<p><b>Cabinet</b> <b>16 June 2014</b></p> <p><b>Report from the Strategic Director</b> <b>Regeneration and Growth</b></p>
For Action	Wards affected: Tokyngton
<p><b>Leasing of Office Accommodation Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ</b></p>	

\*Appendix 1 is not for publication

Appendix 1 is not for publication as it contains the following category of exempt information as specified in Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, namely:

“Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)”

## 1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Following twelve months occupation to review the utilisation of space within the Civic Centre and, if appropriate, to approve leasing of office accommodation at Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley

## 2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Cabinet approve that a lease of up to 10 years is entered into on office accommodation in the Civic Centre in accordance with the details set out in the confidential appendix

## 3.0 DETAIL

### Background

- 3.1 Brent Council currently provides administration office space for 2300 FTE staff at the Civic Centre. There are 1535 workstations in an office area of 12,831 sq. m. (1 workstation per 8.36 sq. m). This represents a good overall density for use of the building and is fully in accordance with best practice guidance taking account of the overall design and demands placed on a naturally ventilated building.

- 3.2 The building has been occupied since June 2013, with a full compliment of council staff occupying the building from September 2013 following a phased relocation over the preceding three months. Since then the building has been fully operational and during this period, despite inevitable teething problems with the building, the Council has not suffered a single loss of business hours. Over the past year, as is typical for all new builds, the Council has worked with consultants and the main contractor, Skanska, to work through a schedule of defects and snags. This process has been managed as part of the contractual Defects Liability Period which expired on 14 May 2014.
- 3.3 This defects process has entailed the council and its consultants engaging with the main contractor Skanska on a series of mini projects rectifying a number of defects and snags identified during part of the post construction and post occupation phase. The vast majority of these matters have now been successfully resolved and the remaining items will be resolved over the coming months. There are now additional building related projects which the Council will initiate and which will be led by Property's FM Team with costs contained within the overall Civic Centre Budget
- 3.4 This development project and the end of the Defects Liability Period allows the Council to begin to look longer term and seek to maximize the utilization of the Civic Centre. We can do this by a combination of measures; some will be HR related e.g. by re-launching the Council's flexible working policy, some will be building/construction work related - re-examining the break out areas and other non core office spaces within the Admin areas to possibly reconfigure the space to release potential additional office admin areas. Creation of additional work space will then allow the Council to consider additional requests for space from internal and external parties.
- 3.5 As part of the longer term planning, officers have been considering alternative uses and occupiers for any released administrative space within the Civic Centre. Consequently informal discussions have taken place with a party interested in a substantial letting of space within the Civic Centre. Officers have negotiated the terms of any such letting on a without prejudice and subject to contract and Cabinet approval basis. The main terms of this letting are set out in the confidential part of this report. It should be noted the proposal, if accepted, would make a significant contribution towards the revenue target for the Civic Centre. Furthermore it is known that the Council has a substantial financial target to achieve over the next couple of years in order to deliver a balanced budget. Therefore opportunities as presented by this particular commercial letting need to be fully considered.
- 3.6 Currently the first floor, west wing, of the Civic Centre is being held largely vacant except for a small property team, and space for ad hoc occupation such as the recent election team requirements and Skanska operatives. It is also used as informal storage space. Originally identified as the 'Partner Village' space it has been held vacant whilst the Council sought public sector and third sector partners; however to date the area which comprises 342 sq m and can accommodate about 57 workstations has not attracted any group which has adequate funding to take up this space.



- 3.7 Additionally, in terms of space for our Voluntary Sector partners, it is also worth noting that Brent, through a S106 agreement, lease office space from Quintain of approx. 340 sqm at 3,5 and 7 Rutherford Way, Wembley. This is a 5 year lease from October 2013. The building is a modern 2 storey office building which has been sub-let to the CVS Brent where a variety of voluntary sector groups are supported. Therefore the need to be located within the Civic has arguably been met by this alternative provision.
- 3.8 To test the supposition that the Civic Centre could have capacity, subject to a more efficient use of space, the Council's FM Team commissioned a space utilisation survey which has identified areas where additional or more efficient utilisation of space can be secured. This will require some modification but in broad terms can be achieved by better design and use of under used open-plan break out areas on floors 2 – 6. It is anticipated that this could on average create 24 new desk spaces on each floor (120 desks in total).
- 3.9 In addition a number of changes are occurring to staffing in the Civic Centre. In particular the recent contract to outsource the Public Realm maintenance to Veolia will result in staff transferring and moving out of the building, furthermore it is believed that Brent Housing Partnership staff will be transferring to Wates as part of the long term maintenance contract. These staff will be relocated out of the Civic Centre.
- 3.10 Furthermore there are a number of internal pressures to relocate staff to the Civic. These staff were not planned to locate to the Civic Centre when the business case for the building was approved. Some relatively small scale relocations can probably be accommodated as the workstation table below identifies. In addition if staff numbers decrease in future because of further reductions in spending or other outsourcing more space will become available.
- 3.11 Studies have concluded that the space that could most easily be made available for any third party commercial tenant is the upper floors. Therefore in regard to the current proposal officers have looked at the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> West. This space is relatively discrete and can be made reasonably secure for any in-coming tenant. As the rest of the building will remain open plan and accessible, the Council will need to instigate procedures both for internal staff and also with the third party tenant to safeguard the Council operations. This aspect will be considered further subject to Member decision in conjunction with senior staff and HR.
- 3.12 This area (L7W & L8W) currently provides Brent with 134 workstations and totals about 1227 sq.m (about 9.5% of the office space). It has been calculated that staff from this area could relocate to the area identified for the partner village on the first floor. By reconfiguring the space on the first floor it is estimated that 83 workstations can be provided. This leaves a balance of 51 workstations that would need to be provided in the building for Brent staff. As identified at 3.8 above a further 120 desks could be accommodated in the Civic Centre therefore officers would need to decide on where the balance of the 51 workstations would be provided. This is considered to be manageable particularly when added to the staff that will be moving out of the Civic. The

additional workstations could be focused more for staff that are touching in for short periods or are out at meetings for much of the day. The creation of a dedicated touch down zone would be considered as part of this project.

### Workstation Table

Table below demonstrates the potential capacity in the Civic if changes are introduced and the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> floors (west) are vacated for commercial letting.

	Area sq m	Workstations Current	Capacity
Ground floor	49 (vacant)	0	7
1 <sup>st</sup> Floor	342 (vacant) 267 (part occupied)	20 (7 occupied)	83
Current Surplus			83
7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> floors West Wing	1,227	134	Available for commercial occupier
Shortfall of workstations with current layout of Civic			<b>-51</b>
Potential additional desking floors 2 to 6	Throughout Civic		<b>+120</b>
Potential Surplus workstations if occupation density increased			<b>+69</b>

3.13 The security aspects of having a third party commercial occupier will need to be carefully considered. Therefore the Council should not and will not accept any tenant unless deemed acceptable to the image of the Council and the Civic Centre; the one under current consideration is well known to the Council and is reputable with an International standing. However in regard to security issues it should be noted that the Civic already has other 3<sup>rd</sup> parties using the building, Capita, Serco, Metropolitan Police, Europa, Wates Living Space and Brent Housing Partnership. Along with contractual conditions and appropriate management controls it is envisaged that as part of a HR refresh about working in the Civic Centre staff can be reminded again about the need to ensure a clear desk policy is operated and that confidential discussions should take place only in appropriate settings. Therefore at this stage it is suggested that the current physical security arrangements remain in place.

3.14 The confidential Appendix sets out further commercial and other advantages to Brent.

## 4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 These are set out in the confidential appendix

## **5.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 Under Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 the Council has the general power to dispose of properties by way of sale or lease .The essential condition is that the Council obtains the best consideration that is reasonably obtainable unless it is a lease of 7 years or less.

5.2 Disposal on the open market either via auctioneer, marketing agent or to a special purchaser by way of private treaty will satisfy the best consideration requirement.

## **6.0 DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 The building has a very high level of disability access it should be noted that any staff with access needs would be relocated to a location that meets their needs.

## **7.0 STAFFING/ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS (if appropriate)**

7.1 There will be the need to relocate staff working from the 134 workstations from the 8<sup>th</sup> Floor West and 7<sup>th</sup> Floor West.

7.2 There will be increased use of the café on the first floor along with the other publically accessible areas.

## **8.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None

### **Contact Officers**

James Young Head of Assets and Valuation

Richard Barrett, Operational Director Property & Projects

**Andy Donald, Director of Regeneration and Growth**

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



**Cabinet**  
16 June 2014

## **Report from the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth**

For Action

Wards affected:  
Welsh Harp

### **Expansion of Woodfield SEN School**

#### **1.0 Summary**

- 1.1 This report describes to members current proposals on the delivery of the agreed expansion of places at Woodfield Special Educational Needs (SEN) School. The proposal is to re-use modular units that previously formed part of the temporary school provision for The Village School, which are now redundant following the opening of the new Village School. The report then requests Cabinet approval for the contract variation proposed.

#### **2.0 Recommendations**

That the Cabinet:

- 2.1 Note the proposal to deliver the expansion of Woodfield SEN School by the re-use of modular units from the temporary Village School
- 2.2 Approve a variation to the Council's contract with Henry Brothers (Magherafelt) Limited (The Village School Decant & Legacy Contract) to include the proposed expansion works for Woodfield School up to a maximum value of £1.3m.

#### **3.0 Detail**

- 3.1 The Council has been under pressure to create additional school places arising from increased demand for specialist education placements, particularly over the last 3 years.
- 3.2 In August 2012, the Executive received a report on the need to expand school places across primary, secondary and SEN sectors. A proposal to expand Woodfield by 30 places was included in that report. Subsequent work on the proposal by Children & Families Department led to a statutory consultation on expansion culminating in an Executive approval in August 2013 to expand by 40 places from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2014. The specific focus on expanding the capacity of

Woodfield is to meet the SEN of secondary aged pupils identified with Severe Learning Difficulties (SLD) and Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD). The school is currently designated to meet the needs of pupils with Moderate Learning Disabilities (MLD). Accordingly the Executive approval of August 2013 also covered changing the designation of the school from MLD only to MLD, SLD and ASD.

- 3.3 It is proposed that a 40 place extension will be built with classrooms designed to meet the needs of the new pupils with SLD and ASD alongside those with MLD who already access the school. The total project value is anticipated to be £1.3m. As per the August Executive approval, the current School Expansion Schemes Programme of Works includes a budget allocation for the provision of 40 places at the school. This budget has been reduced from a forecast of £1.5m, as reported in August 2013, to £1.3m as the school is no longer in a position to contribute the forecast £200k to the capital costs and the scheme scope has been adjusted accordingly. The £1.3m funding is to be provided from unsupported borrowing for which the Schools Forum has agreed to meet the capital repayment and borrowing charges from the Dedicated Schools Grant.
- 3.4 During the construction of The Village School, the pupils of The Village School (TVS) were decanted to temporary accommodation at Kingsbury High School, for the duration of the construction works. The temporary decant accommodation provided was a c. £4,700,000, 2,600m<sup>2</sup> two-storey modular accommodation consisting of 84 pre-fabricated modules. The contractor for these decant works was Henry Brothers Ltd. It should be noted that this was not simply the supply of 84 portacabins, but a bespoke design that included modules being combined together to form a proper school including specialised SEN classrooms and therapy spaces and a double-height school hall.
- 3.6 The Henry Brothers decant contract also included some legacy works. Following completion of The Village School Main Scheme, the 84 module, temporary decant accommodation was dismantled with 28 modules relocated elsewhere on the Kingsbury High School site. The remaining 56 modules were transferred for storage in the car park to the rear of Brent House. These works were completed by Henry Brothers under their main contract.
- 3.7 It is now proposed to utilise the skills and knowledge built up by Henry Brothers following the Village School decant contract to relocate many of the units at Brent House onto permanent or semi-permanent sites, mainly for school expansion schemes. The proposed route for this is by varying their Decant and Legacy scheme contract for TVS.
- 3.8 The time-scale for delivery of this project necessitates the request to vary the existing Henry Brothers contract. Whilst there are advantages to this approach it is not normal practice and will be reviewed as part of a “lessons learned” workshop to review the events which led to the need for this report. As a precursor to this Henry Brothers have already been appointed to provide pre-construction services in the sum of around £100K. These pre-construction services consist of design of the extension at Woodfield SEN School using some of the modular units currently stored at Brent House, up to the stage of planning approval. A contract of this value would normally have required the prior use of a quotation process, inviting at least three companies to quote; however an exemption from this was granted by the Chief Finance Officer as provided for in Contract Standing Orders.



- 3.9 Once planning approval is obtained, further design work will be necessary (not covered by the current pre-construction services contract) and then the build phase will start. Again it is proposed to use Henry Brothers for this, and to vary their original design and build contract for The Village School Decant and Legacy works accordingly.
- 3.10 The justification for seeking to vary the Village School Decant and Legacy Contract in this way is as follows:
1. It is cost effective :
  2. Speeds up the process
  3. The proposed contractor has prior and specialised knowledge of the subject-matter.
  4. A contract for pre-construction services has already been awarded that involves the re-use of the units from the Village School, and this contract would have to be aborted if the main works cannot proceed on the same basis.

To expand on point 1,

1. This is a construction method used by only a small number of contractors and from previous project experience on modular accommodation, contractors generally have higher overhead & profit costs which is reflected in Henry Brothers overhead & profit percentage of 10% within their pre-construction submission.
2. Henry Brother would most likely also have allowed for risk within their pre-construction submission as they are well familiar with the construction methods used from the TVS decant and Legacy projects.
3. If this project was to be tendered, there would most certainly be a higher overhead & profit percentage from all contractors as they are unfamiliar with the current modules so there would be an element of risk to their submission.

To expand on point 2, the reason for the urgency indicated above is because the additional SEN school places are scheduled to be provided from September 2014 and the scheme is already under severe time pressure. It would take at least 4 months to run a fresh procurement process, which could only start from when the planning designs were completed. Under the current programme, the planning design will be completed on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2014 and therefore it would not be possible to appoint a contractor until well into the autumn.

To expand on point 3, Henry Brothers Ltd. originally did the detailed design for, and manufactured the modules that are proposed to be used for the Woodfield School expansion. These units are bespoke and it is recommended that Henry Brothers Ltd., with their experience and knowledge of the logistics and construction involved, carry out the detailed design and construction works.

- 3.11 It should be noted that places are to be made available from September 2014, however (assuming that the Cabinet approve the variation to Henry Brothers contract) the earliest that the places will be delivered is Spring 2015. Children & Families department have confirmed that eight places have already been offered and accepted for September 2014, however these children will be accommodated by the school in a library room providing fit-for-purpose facilities

- 3.12 This expansion is a permanent development providing a minimum life expectancy of 25 years. The structure is fit for purpose and will be built with modern facilities to meet the current requirements.

#### 4.0 Legal Implications

- 4.1 The Council's requirement for a works contractor to build the extension at Woodfield SEN school has an estimated contract value of around £1.3m which means that it is below the EU threshold at which works contracts have to be tendered. There is therefore no breach of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (the EU Regulations) in not tendering such a contract requirement. However in making procurement decisions, the Council still needs to act in accordance with the general duties set out in the EU Regulations, to act fairly, transparently and in a non-discriminatory way. However a challenge on this basis (that the Council did not act fairly in deciding not to tender the works) would not succeed, because an organisation bringing a claim under the EU Regulations first has to have suffered loss as a result of the breach. Loss of a chance to be selected to tender is too remote to lead to any quantification of loss.
- 4.2 As the original contract awarded to Henry Brothers was itself tendered under the EU Regulations, it is possible that one of the original unsuccessful tenderers from that exercise could bring a challenge that the contract has been varied to such an extent make it a completely different contract from the one advertised; they would then argue that if this additional work had been included from the outset, then they might have priced differently and had a greater chance of winning, such that they suffered loss as a result. The test to be applied is whether the change to the original contract is material. The relevant EU test case, *Presstext*, said that in deciding whether a change was material, a court would look at (a) change in economic balance between the contracting parties (in this case, it is proposed to vary a contract valued at £4,826,670 by a further £1.3 m); (b) whether the scope is extended considerably to include services not otherwise covered (in this case there is only a small extension in scope because the original contract provided in any event for dismantling of the temporary Village school and re-erection of some of the units elsewhere); (c) inclusion of matters which, if these had been included in the original contract would have allowed for the acceptance of a different tender ie other than Henry Brothers (unlikely to apply as Henry Brothers were a clear winner in the original tender exercise). Here the Council is most vulnerable in relation to (a), however a challenge is still considered very unlikely because, as above, the organisation alleging breach of the EU Regulations has to have suffered loss.
- 4.3 Under the Council's own Contract Standing Orders and other constitutional requirements, the only limitation on ability to vary a contract is the need to get appropriate approval. Contract Standing Order 112(d) requires only that the decision-maker receives and considers a report "setting out all relevant information necessary to give such approvals". As the variation exceeds £250,000 in value, the decision-maker is the Cabinet (part 4 of the Constitution).

## **5.0 Financial Implications**

- 5.1 The School Expansion Schemes Programme of Works includes a budget allocation of £1.3m for this scheme to be funded from unsupported borrowing for which the capital repayment and borrowing charges will be met from the Dedicated Schools Grant.

## **6.0 Diversity Implications**

- 6.1 This project will create an additional 40 school places for children aged 5-11 with Special Educational Needs. As such an Equalities Impact Assessment was prepared at the time that the Executive considered the Woodfield statutory expansion report. This was presented to Executive on 19<sup>th</sup> August 2013 and highlights the positive diversity implications of the expansion.

## **7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications**

- 7.1 None for the immediate purpose of this report however the establishment of a significant number of new school places brings a requirement for additional teaching and non-teaching staff.

### **Contact Officers**

Vinod P Pansuria  
Principal Building Surveyor – Schools Capital Programme  
Property & Projects, Regeneration & Growth  
[vinod.pansuria@brent.gov.uk](mailto:vinod.pansuria@brent.gov.uk) 020 8937 1339

Cheryl Painting  
Programme Manager – Schools Capital Programme  
Property & Projects, Regeneration & Growth  
[Cheryl.painting@brent.gov.uk](mailto:Cheryl.painting@brent.gov.uk) 020 8937 3227

Richard Barrett  
Operations Director – Property & Projects  
Regeneration & Growth  
[Richard.barrett@brent.gov.uk](mailto:Richard.barrett@brent.gov.uk) 020 8937 1330

Andy Donald  
Strategic Director of Regeneration & Growth

This page is intentionally left blank



**Cabinet**  
16 June 2014

## **Report from the Director of Regeneration and Growth**

For Action

Wards affected:  
ALL

### **Authority to tender a contract for Rough Sleepers' Outreach and Housing Advice and Resettlement Services.**

#### **1.0 Summary**

- 1.1 The background to this report is that Brent has since 2011-12 seen a significant and above trend for London boroughs increase in rough sleeping numbers, sufficient for the borough to commission Homeless Link to conduct in November 2013 an independent Needs Analysis for Rough Sleepers in the borough (see attached background paper).
- 1.2 This report provides an overview of the current trend towards an increase in the numbers of those sleeping rough in the borough, illustrating the clear need to maintain the current level of resourcing for rough sleeping services for the foreseeable future, but identifying, in light of the Homeless Link Needs Analysis, the desirability of remodelling the structure of these services to sharpen focus and so improve quality.
- 1.3 The report requests approval to invite tenders as required by Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89 in respect of a contract for Rough Sleepers Outreach Services and a contract for Rough Sleepers Housing Advice and Resettlement Services.

#### **2.0 Recommendations**

- 2.1 The Cabinet to approve inviting tenders for a contract for Rough Sleepers' Outreach Services and a contract for Rough Sleepers' Housing Advice and Resettlement Services on the basis of the pre - tender considerations set out in paragraph 3.21 of this report.

2.2 The Cabinet to give approval to officers to evaluate the tenders referred to in 2.1 above on the basis of the evaluation criteria set out in paragraph 3.21 of this report.

### 3.0 Detail

#### *Background and context*

3.1 The council has been aligning its own housing and homelessness strategies and action plans to government led initiatives related to the prevention and alleviation of street homelessness since the first major government strategy in 1999 'Coming in from the cold'. The most recent government strategy launched in November 2011 'Vision to end rough sleeping: No Second Night Out nationwide' follows on from a Greater London Authority (GLA) initiative 'No second night out' being driven by the Mayor's Office and the London Delivery Board (LDB) established in 2009, with the aim of ending rough sleeping by December 2012. Brent has been a member of the LDB along with some other London boroughs and other key partners such as DCLG, the UK Border Agency (UKBA), Police and various voluntary sector groups. The emphasis of the current strategy is similar to previous strategies in its aim to work collaboratively and tackle the underlying causes of rough sleeping such as worklessness, addiction and mental illness. However, the most recent strategy acknowledges the complexities of completely eradicating rough sleeping and has moved towards the aim of ensuring that rough sleepers who are new to the street, do not spend a second night on the streets. Key success measures now focus on the ability to prevent those new to sleeping on the street becoming people who 'live' on the street.

#### *Defining and quantifying rough sleeping*

3.2 Definitions of 'rough sleeping' have changed over time; until 2010 rough sleeping was defined as those 'sleeping, or bedded down, in the open air, or in buildings or other places not designed for habitation'. In 2010 the definition expanded to include rough sleepers 'about to bed down' e.g. sitting or standing near their bedding but not actually lying down and to people living in tents.

3.3 Formal counts of people sleeping rough have been conducted in Brent since 2006 and the outcomes of these are set out in Table 1 below. These figures represent a snap shot of the extent of rough sleeping on a given night where known rough sleeping 'hot spots' are visited and rough sleepers counted in accordance with DCLG guidance described in paragraph 3.2 above.

**Table 1: Rough sleeping street count snapshots.**

<b>Date of count</b>	<b>Number of rough sleepers counted</b>
November 2007	1
November 2008	4
November 2009	4
November 2010	3
November 2011	7
November 2012	11
November 2013	6

- 3.4 While they can make a useful yardstick by which to measure year on year changes in the number of people sleeping rough in a borough, annual street counts, being a one night snapshot are not the most accurate methodology for establishing a boroughs number of rough sleepers and are subject to anomalous counts caused by poor weather or the like.
- 3.5 A more accurate picture of a borough's number of rough sleeping can be derived from data downloaded from CHAIN, the online database outreach teams use to record all their streets contacts. It's worth noting that Camden chose not to do a street count in 2013, choosing instead to make an estimate of the numbers sleeping rough in the borough based on their CHAIN data, as they believed it likely this would yield a more accurate picture.
- 3.6 Table 2 sets out the number of rough sleeper contacts (using the DCLG definitions as set out in paragraph 3.2) recorded on CHAIN for BRENT from April 2005 to March 2013. Official figures for the year 2013-14 are due to be published on 30/06/14.

**Table 2: Number of rough sleeping contacts recorded on CHAIN in each year**

<b>Financial year</b>	<b>Total number of rough sleepers contacted.</b>	<b>Flow (new to rough sleeping)</b>	<b>Stock (living on the streets 2 plus years)</b>	<b>Returners (returning to the street after at least a year of settled living )</b>
2005/2006	43	Not recorded	Not recorded	Not recorded
2006/2007	61	Not recorded	Not recorded	Not recorded
2007/2008	83	Not recorded	Not recorded	Not recorded
2008/2009	139	132	2	5
2009/2010	75	68	3	4
2010/2011	39	38	1	0
2011/2012	166	155	6	5
2012/2013	235	208	9	6

- 3.7 These figures demonstrate that while according to street count figures (Table 1) Brent experienced a 267% increase in the numbers sleeping rough in the borough over the two financial years 2011/12 and 2012/13, CHAIN data indicates that the increase over this period was nearer 500%.
- 3.8 This compares with a national average increase in the number of rough sleepers of 23% and a London average increase of 43%.
- 3.9 While official figures will not be available till 30/06/14, an interim analysis of our CHAIN data indicates that the number of verified rough sleepers recorded on CHAIN as having been contacted by outreach services in Brent for the year 2013/14 will be of the order of 325, an increase of just over a third on last year's numbers
- 3.10 Identified contributors to this increase in numbers include the impact of the recession and welfare reform and an element of under-reporting in 2010/2011, combined with additional services put in place across London from April 2012 that supplemented Brent's commissioned rough sleeping service, doubling the resources available to them and in doing so significantly enhancing their ability to identify (and work with) rough sleepers.
- 3.11 There is also growing evidence that indicates both that the numbers of Central and Eastern European rough sleepers in the borough were not accurately recorded pre 2011/12 and that these numbers are growing for Brent above trend in comparison with other London boroughs.
- 3.12 Brent has not traditionally had high numbers of people 'living on the street' but again this was an increasing trend over the financial years 2011/12 and 2012/13 with Brent having six people living on the streets at the end of 2013. The interim analysis of our CHAIN data indicates that the borough will record a similar number of people 'living on the street' for the year 2013/14. This is of concern due to the complexities associated with the reasons people live on the streets and the challenges faced in assisting people into settled living or supporting and/or removing those who have no recourse to public funds.
- 3.13 The council currently has a contract for the provision of rough sleeper services in the borough. The contract was due to expire at the end of March 2014 but has been extended to the beginning of October 2014 to tie in with the proposed start dates of the new contracts. A Needs Analysis, including a review of this contract, has recently been undertaken by Homeless Link.

*Issues arising from the Needs Analysis conducted by Homeless Link.*

- 3.14 While Homeless Link's Needs Analysis identified examples of innovative and good practice in the current provider's outreach practices, it also identified that the current provider, having been given the latitude to choose how to allocate resources between the outreach and housing advice and resettlement elements of its commissioned rough services, significantly biased the allocation of resources to housing advice and resettlement, to the detriment of the outreach element of the service.



- 3.15 At the time of the Needs Analysis the current provider was operating three outreach shifts a week, of three hours duration each. This represented a resource allocation to outreach services of less than one FTE post out of the four FTE Outreach and Resettlement posts the current provider receives funding for, the remaining resources being allocated to its building based housing advice and resettlement service.
- 3.16 Since the Needs Analysis was conducted, the current provider has allocated greater resources to outreach, committing to increase the length of each outreach shift from three hours to six.
- 3.17 Going forward, commissioning the street outreach and housing advice and resettlement elements of Brent's Rough Sleeping Services as two separate contracts, with separate service specifications and performance indicators would ensure that each service was allocated the resources intended and tighten each service's focus on delivering the specific area of work they were commissioned to deliver.

### *Conclusion*

- 3.18 There is still a demonstrable need for this service and one that, if the authority is to effectively address the numbers rough sleeping rough in the borough, is resourced as a minimum with the same four FTE posts as the current service.
- 3.19 Officers consider that responsiveness and accountability of these services would be further enhanced by commissioning the Street Outreach and Housing Advice and Resettlement components of the service in two separate lots. This proposal has been discussed with the current provider when they were debriefed on Homeless Link's needs analysis.
- 3.20 It is possible that cost savings may be achieved through realising reduced hourly contract rates that have resulted from market conditions and efficiency savings achieved by providers across the sector in response to austerity.

### **Pre Tender Considerations**

- 3.21 In accordance with Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89, pre-tender considerations have been set out below for the approval of the Cabinet.

<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Response</b>
(i)	The nature of the service.	A contract for a Rough Sleepers' Outreach Service and a contract for a Housing Advice and Resettlement Service
(ii)	The estimated value.	The estimated value of the Rough Sleepers' Outreach Service is £65k per annum, £195K over the 3 year initial term, or £325k over the potential 5 year term. The estimated value of the Housing Advice and Resettlement Service is £65k per annum, £195K over the 3 year initial term, or £325k over the potential 5

Ref.	Requirement	Response	
		year term.	
(iii)	The contract term.	Both contracts will be let for an initial period of 3 years with an option to extend by up to a further 2 years.	
(iv)	The tender procedure to be adopted.	A single stage tender process.	
v)	The procurement timetable.	<b>Indicative dates are:</b>	
		Adverts placed	16/06/14
		Invite to tender	23/06/14
		Deadline for tender submissions	16/07/14
		Panel evaluation and shortlist for interview	21/07/14
		Interviews and contract decision	28/07/14
		Report recommending Contract award circulated internally for comment	30/07/14
		Cabinet approval	August 2014
		Cabinet call in period of 5 days	Following Cabinet Approval
		Contract Mobilisation	September 2014
		Contract start date	06/10/14
(vi)	The evaluation criteria and process.	<p>At tender evaluation stage, the panel will evaluate the tenders for both contracts using a 40%:60% price:quality split.</p> <p>Price of both lots will be evaluated on the basis of a price prospective provider's quote for delivering the specified service using a comparative scoring methodology.</p> <p>Quality for the contracts will be evaluated against the</p>	

Ref.	Requirement	Response
		<p>following criteria:</p> <p><i>Criteria for the Rough Sleeper's Street Outreach Service;</i></p> <p>RSOS 1) Proposals as to how the tenderer's previous experience will be applied to provide a high quality outreach service to rough sleepers that delivered demonstrable constructive outcomes for the rough sleepers worked with</p> <p>RSOS 2) The appropriateness and effectiveness of the tenderer's proposed systems and working methods to deliver the Brent Rough Sleepers' Outreach Service,</p> <p>RSOS 3) The Tenderer's proposals for how they will maximise the impact of the service within the available resources.</p> <p>RSOS 4) Proposals with regard to partnership work with other providers to maximize the service offer to service users and improve outcomes.</p> <p>RSOS 5) The appropriateness and effectiveness of the tenderer's proposed systems for ensuring integration of service offer between the Rough Sleepers Outreach and Advice &amp; Resettlement services.</p> <p><i>Criteria for the Rough Sleeper's Street Housing Advice and Resettlement Service;</i></p> <p>RSA&amp;RS 1) Proposals as to how the tenderer's previous experience will be used to provide a high quality advice and resettlement service that supports single homeless people in securing stable accommodation and sustaining it.</p> <p>RSA&amp;RS 2) The appropriateness and effectiveness of the tenderer's proposed systems and working methods to deliver the Brent Rough Sleepers' Advice &amp; Resettlement Service.</p> <p>RSA&amp;RS 3) Proposals demonstrating the tenderer's ability to support Brent rough sleepers assisted into accommodation with accessing appropriate education, training or employment</p>

Ref.	Requirement	Response
		<p>RSA&amp;RS 4) Proposals demonstrating the tenderer's ability to support Brent rough sleepers who have previously been assisted into accommodation maintain their tenancies should they later experience difficulties that threaten these tenancies</p> <p>RSA&amp;RS 5) Proposals with regard to the partnership work with other providers to maximize the service offer to service users and improve outcomes,</p> <p>RSA&amp;RS 6) The appropriateness and effectiveness of the tenderer's proposed systems for ensuring integration of service offer between the Rough Sleepers Advice &amp; Resettlement and Outreach services.</p>
(vii)	Any business risks associated with entering the contract.	No specific business risks are considered to be associated with entering into the proposed contract. Financial Services and Legal Services have been consulted concerning this contract.
(viii)	The Council's Best Value duties.	This procurement process and on-going contractual requirement will ensure that the Council's Best Value obligations are met.
(ix)	Consideration of Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012	See section 8 below.
(x)	Any staffing implications, including TUPE and pensions.	This service is currently provided by an external contractor and there are no TUPE or pension implications for the council arising from retendering this contract.
(xi)	The relevant financial, legal and other considerations.	See section 4 and 5 below,

3.3 The Cabinet is asked to give its approval to these proposals as set out in the recommendations and in accordance with Standing Order 89.

#### 4.0 Financial Implications

4.1 The estimated value of each of the service contracts is £65k per annum (£130k for both contracts combined), £195k over the initial three year term of the contract (£390k for both contracts) and up to £325k if the council exercises its option to extend the contract by up to another two years (£650k for both contracts).

- 4.2 It is anticipated that the cost of these contracts will be funded from the existing temporary accommodation budget.
- 4.3 The cost of the current contract with the current provider for the current service is £154k per annum.
- 4.4 Since the service was last commissioned market conditions/efficiency savings across the sector have resulted in reduced hourly contract rates, it is anticipated that this will be reflected in the pricing of the new contract. This is the basis for the projected reduced annual cost of £130k per annum for both contracts of for the retendered services.
- 4.5 Based on the assumption that the new services will start from the beginning of October 2014, the planned expenditure for these services for the current financial year is £142k.

## **5.0 Legal Implications**

- 5.1 The estimated total values of the contract for a Rough Sleepers' Outreach Service and the contract for a Housing Advice and Resettlement Service are both £325k and as such in excess of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (the "EU Regulations") threshold for Services. Both Services are classed as Part B Services for the purposes of the EU Regulations and as such are subject to partial application of the EU Regulations, including non-discrimination in the technical specification and notification of the contract award to the EU Publications Office. Whilst the contract is not therefore subject to the full tendering requirements of EU Regulations, it is however subject to the overriding EU Treaty principles of equality of treatment, fairness and transparency in the award of contracts.5.2 The estimated total value of each contract is in excess of £250,000 making the contracts High Value Contracts under the council's Constitution. As such the contracts are subject to the Council's own Standing Orders and Financial Regulations in respect of High Value Contracts and the Cabinet is required to consider approval of the pre-tender considerations as set out in paragraph 3.21 above (Standing Order 89) and the inviting of tenders (Standing Order 88).
- 5.2 Once the tendering process has been undertaken, Officers will report back to the Cabinet in accordance with Contract Standing Orders, explaining the process undertaken in tendering the contracts and making recommendations for their award.
- 5.3 In the present case if the contracts are awarded to a new contractor the Transfer of Employment (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 ("TUPE") is likely to apply so as to transfer from the current to the new contractor those employees of the current contractor who spend all or most of their working time on the activities taken over by the new contractor.
- 5.4 The council's duties in connection with the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 are contained in Section 8.

## **6.0 Diversity Implications**

- 6.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment for the services has been carried out and a copy of it is attached as Appendix A.

## **7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications)**

- 7.1 This service is currently provided by an external contractor and there are no implications for council staff arising from retendering the contract.
- 7.2 No accommodation implications arise for the council out of the retendering of this contract.

## **8.0 Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012**

- 8.1 Since 31 January 2013, the council, in common with all public authorities subject to the EU Regulations, has been under duty pursuant to the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 to consider how the services being procured might improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of its area; how, in conducting the procurement process, the council might act with a view to securing that improvement; and whether the council should undertake consultation. This duty applies to the procurement of the proposed contract as Part B Services over the threshold for application of the EU Regulations are subject to the requirements of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012.
- 8.2 The services being procured have as their primary aim improving the social and economic well being of rough sleepers, one of the most vulnerable groups in Brent. Users are as far as is practicable, considering the degree of personal crisis they are often experiencing when engaging with these services, consulted to ensure they best meet their needs and the views of users will be taken into account in these procuring services.
- 8.3 In addressing the needs of rough sleepers and reducing the numbers of people rough sleeping across the borough these services will also reduce the incidence of rough sleeping related anti-social behaviour and the impact rough sleeping can have on the public domain and wider environment, in doing so improving the economic, social and environmental well-being of the wider community.
- 8.4 There is a limited market for the delivery of these services; however, officers will endeavour to describe the scope of service in such a way as to further meet the requirements of the Act during the procurement process.

## Background Papers

Homeless Link Rough Sleeping Needs Analysis.

### Contact Officer

Adam Salmon  
Street Population Coordinator  
Extension: 2459  
Mail to: [adam.salmon@brent.gov.uk](mailto:adam.salmon@brent.gov.uk)

**ANDY DONALD**  
**Strategic Director Regeneration and Growth**

This page is intentionally left blank



# Brent Needs Analysis

**November 2013**

## **ABOUT THIS REPORT**

This report is the result of work undertaken through October and November 2013 to analyse the reasons behind a sharp increase in rough sleeping in the London borough of Brent.

The purpose of this report is to outline the findings of this needs analysis and to make recommendations to the council going forward.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Brent has recorded a 500% increase in rough sleeping on CHAIN over the past 3 years from 77 in 2009/10 to 233 in 2012/13. This is despite the No Second Night Out interventions introduced by the Mayor's office and although there has been a rise in Central and Eastern European rough sleepers this is not the primary reason for the sharp increase.

This report seeks to understand why there has been a large increase in the number of people sleeping rough in Brent and contains a number of recommendations to improve the identification of rough sleepers, referral routes into accommodation and move on from hostels for former rough sleepers.

## **METHODOLOGY**

All key stakeholders working with rough sleepers in the borough were consulted during this project. These included: Start Plus manager; Ashford place Outreach manager, Director of Services, outreach team; Hostel managers; Area managers for Provider agencies; former area manager for provider agencies; hostel staff; hostel service users; No Second Night Out (NSNO) Director; NSNO West London Hub manager, CHAIN Director, Manager of London Street Rescue; key personnel at the council, including the Start Plus manager, the lead on rough sleeping and the Director responsible for homelessness and housing options.

All key data was consulted including: Ashford Place outreach data; CHAIN; Hostels' records; No Second Night out data. A meeting was also held solely to discuss the data to ensure we had an accurate picture of the rough sleeping issue in Brent. (See DATA section below)

We also accompanied outreach workers on a shift on the streets of Brent.

## **DEFINITION OF A ROUGH SLEEPER**

In 2010 the Government widened the definition of rough sleeping and when estimating or counting it is essential that those included in the count figure fall into the following definition:

*'People sleeping, about to bed down (sitting on/in or standing next to their bedding) or actually bedded down in the open air (such as on the streets, in tents, doorways, parks, bus shelters or encampments). People in buildings or other places not designed for habitation (such as stairwells, barns, sheds, car parks, cars, derelict boats, stations, or 'bashes').*

Rough sleeping is the most visible and in many ways the most dangerous and traumatic form of homelessness. Many rough sleepers 'self-medicate' with drugs and/or alcohol in order to escape the reality of their situation and dull the negative aspects of the experience. In many cases rough sleepers arrive on the streets with low level needs and develop high needs in a short space of time. These needs can lead to them presenting at A&E or the police station neither of which can properly cope with their needs, and the inappropriate use of which presents an increased cost to these services.

## ROUGH SLEEPING DATA IN BRENT

The Combined Homelessness and Information Network (CHAIN) is London's database on rough sleeping and the street population. Over 80 projects contribute information to CHAIN and outreach teams record all their records of verified rough sleepers here. By having access to CHAIN, agencies and workers can:

- Find background information about their clients
- View information to help with support planning
- Access information to help with linking clients in with available services
- View the history of a client's engagement with services such as outreach teams, hostels, day centres and resettlement teams

### CHAIN Figures

Number of people seen rough sleeping by outreach teams in Brent from 2009/10 to 2012/13:

2009/10	77	
2010/11	39	29% decrease
2011/12	166	400% increase
2012/13	233	40% increase

This is an almost 500% increase in rough sleeping from 2010 to 2013 (39 to 233), although it is worth noting that the biggest increase happened in 2011/12 and that trend of increasing numbers of rough sleepers has continued since then.

### Bi-Monthly CHAIN report 1/May to 30/June 2013

New Rough sleepers: 52.

44% of clients are CEE (Central or Eastern European)

### Bi-Monthly CHAIN report July-August 2013

New Rough sleepers: 45.

31% of clients are CEE

CHAIN data for all of London shows that there was an increase of 13% in the number of people seen sleeping rough during the period 2012/13 compared to the previous year (6,437 and 5,678 respectively). However, the number of entrenched rough sleepers (people seen sleeping rough in all four quarters of a given year) is low (3%). People sleeping rough have a range of support needs, most commonly mental health (44%), alcohol (41%) and drugs (28%).

### DCLG figures for rough sleeping counts in Brent

These are figures acquired via the snapshot of one night's count and consist of the number of people seen sleeping out that night. Unfortunately the next count takes place after the publication of this report.

2011 = 7

2012 = 12

The Government produces annual statistical releases based on counts and estimates which give an approximation of how many people sleep rough in England on a 'typical night'<sup>1</sup> The latest figures for rough sleeping are provided for autumn 2012 and show that the total of rough sleeping counts and estimates in England was 2,309. This figure has risen by over 30% since

---

<sup>1</sup> The typical night is always between October 1th and November 30th. If the counts were conducted in Summer there is some evidence to suggest numbers might be higher

autumn 2010. About a quarter of rough sleepers recorded in these counts and estimates are in London.

### **Rough sleepers from Eastern Europe in Brent**

Over the last two quarters there have been some large encampments of Romanian rough sleepers within Brent and the neighbouring borough Barnet.

Recently a partnership was formed between the Police, Ashford Place and the UK Border agency to work with the Romanian encampments across Barnet and Brent. If people are exercising their treaty rights and working then Ashford Place will support them to find better accommodation as well as a range of other support to aid their welfare. If they are not working, UKBA and the Police will work with them to leave the country.

### **CURRENT PATHWAY FOR ROUGH SLEEPERS**

The current pathway for a rough sleeper (RS) in Brent is as follows

- I. A member of the public or public agency (e.g. police) spots a rough sleeper in Brent and calls the council, outreach team or Streetlink
- II. These enquiries are directed to Ashford Place, the organisation which has the contract for outreach services in the borough.
- III. The outreach team carry out shifts 3 times a week on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday from 3.30am to 6.30am.
- IV. The Outreach team arrive on shift and read the forms – the locations of every sighting are provided with a grid reference and a Google earth picture. The form also carries information regarding the person's potential support needs. The outreach team also keep a list of 'e-referrals' who are entrenched clients who they have not previously been able to convince to come inside from the streets
- V. The team use a car and drive to the locations on the referral forms
- VI. They make first contact with the rough sleeper and they ask the person to attend the day centre during the following day
- VII. At the end of each shift the Outreach team record the rough sleepers they have seen on CHAIN.
- VIII. One member of the team passes on the information of each shift to their manager and members of their resettlement team.
- IX. If the client attends the day centre Ashford Place carries out a full assessment of the person's needs.
- X. The rough sleeper is then referred to the Start Plus Team, which then refers them to the NPRS (Non Priority Rough Sleeper) Bed & Breakfast provision. There are currently 25 beds for NPRS available in the borough which was increased from 15. On average, rough sleepers wait 21 nights<sup>2</sup> before admission to the NPRS accommodation.
- XI. In winter, rough sleepers are referred to the temporary night shelters while waiting for NPRS accommodation to be available to them.
- XII. If the rough sleeper finds a place in the NPRS they are then supported by Ashford Place and invited to a group session once a week. In some circumstances, Ashford Place workers may visit the person in B&B.
- XIII. The rough sleeper then stays in the NRPS accommodation for 3 months until they are moved predominantly into the private rented sector or in some cases into supported accommodation (a hostel).

---

<sup>2</sup> Length of stay data was provided by Ashford Place

See diagram below:



## OUTREACH SERVICE

The outreach in the borough is carried out by Ashford Place (formerly Cricklewood Homeless Concern). They have an outreach & resettlement team. Two of the outreach/resettlement workers are funded by the West London sub region (GLA funds).

As stated above two workers in the team carry out 3 set shifts per week on Monday, Wednesday and Friday from 3.30am – 6.30am. One of the workers only performs the 3 hour shifts plus a Saturday session so is therefore part-time on 9-12 hours per week. Ashford Place also state that they will go out on an ad hoc basis outside of these times if a case is reported to them.

The outreach team's shift is guided by referral forms which are split into two types:

- New referrals which come from multiple sources including telephone calls from the public to Ashford place direct or to other agencies such as the Police and also Streetlink (a phonenumber where the public can call in about a rough sleeper)
- 'e-referrals' which are rough sleepers who are more entrenched on the street and proving hard to move inside. By keeping them on the shift pattern the outreach team can keep a contact and monitor their welfare.

The outreach team uses an excellent targeted approach through their use of Google fusion and Google earth. This means that a rough sleeper's exact location can be provided, even with a picture of the doorway or lane where they are sleeping.

The outreach team seems experienced at planning their nightly route which can be confusing and challenging in such a large borough. They do take time to do this in order to maximise the time available on their shift.

However there are challenges with the outreach team. It is important to state that these challenges were witnessed during one shift and are therefore just a snapshot.

**Timing of the shift:** the time that the shift goes out means that it can be difficult to carry out meaningful work with clients. At one encampment in the park the make-shift shelters where people had slept during the night were empty by the time that the outreach team arrived as those who had slept there had already left the site to go to work. It may therefore be beneficial if the shift went out earlier in the night as it might then be possible to book people found into accommodation on that night.

**Suggestion:** Arrange at least one shift per week that starts earlier

**Interaction:** on this shift, interaction between the outreach workers and the clients appeared limited. Many clients were simply given a business card by the outreach workers with the address of the day centre and told to go there the following day. The business card had no map on it or any resources to pay for travel to get to the day centre and as the borough covers a large geographic area, it seems likely that some rough sleepers do not walk to the day centre.

**Suggestions:** Increase the length of shift to enable more interaction

Ensure a map is provided on the business card, and consider use of single fare bus tickets (saver tickets are available from TFL to charities)

Explain services available from day centre e.g. food, showers, and book appointments for the rough sleeper

**Follow up:** The senior outreach worker ended their shift and immediately departed. The junior worker did the handover with the day team. It was unclear whether a record was made of which rough sleepers then accessed the day centre and were assessed there.

**Suggestion:** Agree a procedure for recording successful presentations to the day centre and how many times to return to the rough sleeper if they do not present.

**Referrals:** On the shift we accompanied there were 22 rough sleepers who had been referred to the outreach team. However, the team only managed to see 4 rough sleepers. Although rough sleepers are transient and can move from their sleep sites, this seems a relatively low proportion of rough sleepers found out of the 22 referrals.

**Suggestion:** Increase length of shift

**Partnership working:** The outreach team seemed unaware of other key agencies in the borough, for example, DePaul UK, the youth provider and the outreach team in the neighbouring borough of Camden, CRI. They also had no contact with the hostels in the borough. This is unusual as normally the outreach team, being the frontline service, would need relationships with all providers to see what the available services are. Also partnership with neighbouring outreach teams is crucial as rough sleepers often cross borough boundaries.

**Suggestion:** Facilitate meetings between these providers

## **STREETLINK**

Further confirmation of the above findings is possible using data from Streetlink. Streetlink allows members of the public report someone who is sleeping rough. Streetlink then notifies the Borough so that the individual can be connected to local services

The London Borough of Brent has passed responsibility to Ashford Place for managing the Street Link referrals. This response is provided by Ashford Place outreach team. Each Local Authority area has been asked for a statement detailing the local process for identifying and accessing rough sleeper. Brent's response to Streetlink is:

**'They will aim to make contact with a rough sleeper within 4 - 5 days.'**

Ashford Place should respond to all referrals for their borough, unless the rough sleeper could be eligible for NSNO and Ashford Place don't have a shift out within 24 hours of the referral being made. In this instance LSR will make the initial attempt to find and verify the rough sleeper, but any further attempts to action the referral should be made by Ashford Place.

From December 2012 to the end of September 2013 there was a total of 152 referrals from Streetlink to Ashford Place. 95 were recorded as 'person not found.' The overall percentage of 'person not found' is 62% comparing to a London average of 56%.

There were 41 positive outcomes. Overall there were 111 negative outcomes from the 152 referrals. Negative outcome are recorded as follows:

<b>Local services did not respond</b>	The referral has been passed to the local team but no information has been received in response to our requests for the outcome.
<b>Incomplete referral</b>	In some situations either the Streetlink team or the local team may assess that a referral is inappropriate, for example if there is insufficient information in the referral or if it is not about someone who is currently rough sleeping.
<b>Person not found</b>	The referral has been passed to the local team. They have attempted to make contact with the rough sleeper but they have not yet been able to find them.
<b>Street activity, e.g. begging site</b>	Based on the information provided it appears that the site detailed in the referral is used for begging or other types of street activity. The local teams are aware of these particular sites and will be working with people at these locations on a regular basis.

Brent figures: Of 111 negative outcomes the reasons were:

Incomplete referral	3	2.70%
Local Services did not respond	13	11.71%
Outcome not yet known	0	0.00%
Person not found	95	85.59%
Street Activity, e.g. begging site	0	0.00%

Streetlink's recommendations to Brent are to review the statement detailing the local process for identifying and accessing rough sleeper. As the 'person not found' category is above average consideration should be given to how street shifts are planned and a review of the process should be considered (See the report's recommendations).

It ought to be stated however that Ashford Place's outreach team have reported problems with Streetlink's referral information. This was witnessed on the outreach shift accompanied in preparation of this report where referrals were often lacking crucial information about the location of the rough sleeper and also the support needs with which they might present.

In other areas it is not uncommon for the Outreach teams and the hostels to work very closely together and for the referrals to be quick and responsive to immediate need seen on the street on any given night. The introduction of Start Plus has meant that the hostels and the outreach team do not currently communicate with each other and pass all responsibility of the client on to Start Plus. Inevitably the knowledge of the client's circumstances and any urgency required can be lost in this situation. A recommendation below suggests that the borough look at a fast and more connected pathway into supported accommodation from the street.

## **NO SECOND NIGHT OUT**

The No Second Night Out (NSNO) initiative was launched on 1 April 2011 as a pilot project aimed at ensuring those who find themselves sleeping rough in central London for the first time need not spend a second night on the streets.

The Mayor of London has committed to end rough sleeping in London. To deliver this commitment he established the London Delivery Board (LDB) – a partnership body chaired by the Mayor's Housing Advisor that brings together central London boroughs, government departments, the voluntary sector and key stakeholders. The outcome the LDB is seeking to

deliver is that no one will live on the streets of London and no individual arriving on the streets will sleep out for a second night.

Each week about 60 people are seen rough sleeping for the first time in London. Many of them are new to the capital. NSNO's aim is to ensure there is a rapid response to new rough sleepers, and that they are provided an offer that means they do not have to sleep out for a second night. Other projects such as No-one Living on the Streets exist to support those already rough sleeping and living on the streets.

In Brent the outreach teams and London Street Rescue (who work pan London) bring rough sleepers to a NSNO hub to be assessed if it the first time they have been seen and they are not recorded on CHAIN. That person is then subject to a thorough assessment by NSNO within 72 hours. If the borough knows the person has a local connection and they know there is a bedspace within the borough available then NSNO do not expect the outreach team to bring the rough sleeper to the hub.

The hub then sources accommodation in the local authority where they have a local connection. Sometimes in the case of Eastern Europeans it can lead to a reconnection home.

There have been historic issues between Brent and the West London NSNO hub which were recently resolved at a meeting which took place between the following agencies:

- NSNO
- London Street Rescue
- Ashford Place
- Homeless Link

The minutes of the meeting can be provided. At this meeting it became clear there was a different understanding between agencies regarding the use of NSNO. At a further meeting between Ashford Place, NSNO and Brent council this misunderstanding has been cleared up and a clear protocol has been established going forward. There have also been initial discussions over whether there is a need for a further pop-up NSNO hub for Brent and Barnet clients. Ashford Place has offered to host it if the funding can be found.

## HOSTELS

The borough has two main hostels contracted by the local authority to take referrals for Single homeless people.

**Pound Lane** - an 85 bed hostel which is specified as 'Complex needs' has a contract to provide 55 beds for single homeless people and 30 beds for ex-offenders. The hostel is run by Look Ahead and recently rebuilt with £6m from DCLG's 'Places of Change' programme and reopened in 2010. There are a further 54 units as part of this same contract which are delivered by dispersed accommodation for a range of specialist clients groups although not rough sleepers.

At the time of this report, the Pound Lane hostel is fully occupied but staff interviewed there stated that they were struggling to move people on from the hostel. Admissions data shows that from July to October 2013 10 people were referred to Pound Lane by Start Plus. Throughput through the hostel is currently 12%.

During meetings with both the provider and council both stated that there are too many 'long-stayers' at the hostel and the low throughput figure reinforces this view. The 'Places of Change' programme aimed to improve rough sleeping hostels from the previous culture of institutional buildings to a place of greater engagement and move-on. In the programme nationally move-ons increased by 60%.



Data was requested from the hostel and the contract manager to show the number of Move-ons at the hostel – both planned and unplanned – however this information could not be provided and so this report does not include any further analysis of move-on data.

There are also a number of activities rooms in Pound Lane which are not currently being used by the hostel's residents as an agreement about renting these rooms has not yet been reached with the owners of the building.

**Livingstone house** – is a 92 bed hostel all contracted for single homeless people which has 84 units in the main building and an annexe used for young people.

The service contract in this hostel is also run by Look Ahead but the housing management of this property remains with the landlord Riverside ECHG.

The council informed us that the throughput is 5% per quarter and the void level is 10%. On a one-off visit to the hostel there were 10 empty rooms (over 10% of the capacity), 5 of which were ready to let that day while others were being turned around. However with a number of rough sleepers it seems odd that there should be voids at a hostel intended for single homeless people.

**Suggestion:** Establish communication and updates between hostel providers and outreach teams for hostel providers to inform outreach of their voids.

The landlord informed us that the void problem has become so acute that Riverside ECHG is carrying out an Options Appraisal on the hostel's future use.

**Other accommodation:**

DePaul UK run a 14 bed hostel in Willesden for young people that also contains a crash pad facility for 3 rough sleepers who are new to the street and need 6-8 weeks of respite while they are supported to move-on without the need for homelessness services.

However, DePaul state that they have had problems with voids and poor referrals despite reports that there has been major pressure on the young persons' beds in the annexe of Livingstone house, which is accommodation for 16-21 year old single homeless people.

**Suggestion:** Assess referral procedures to Livingstone House to ensure referrers are aware of alternative provision with DePaul.

**Other possible beds for rough sleepers:**

St Mungo's also has 4 houses in the borough – 54 units in total to keep for alternative use. One is now used for Social Impact Bond Clients and one for Muslim Ex-Offenders with different funding streams – both 9 beds each.

The other two houses - Villiers Road and Larix House - have traditionally been for Clearing House referrals. St Mungo's want to retain this and the Area Manager has recently spoken to the Start Plus team and reminded them of this and that if they have clients in Pound Lane or Livingstone House with CHAIN numbers and St Mungo's have voids they would be happy to take referrals to try to free up some bedspaces for rough sleepers.

Suggestion: Set up an agreement to this effect between providers

**REFERRALS**

Starts Plus is the central referral body for rough sleepers in the borough. They assess clients' needs and decide where clients should they should be referred for accommodation.

They assess people using a form in Appendix 1. As the form shows they assess for primary and secondary needs as follows:

(a) Tick **one** box for your main support need, and **up to three** boxes for other support needs you have

	Primary	Secondary		Primary	Secondary
Advocacy Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Older Person	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alcohol Issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Offender/At risk of Offending	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Care Leaver	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Physical Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Debt Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Physical Health	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dementia	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refugee	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Domestic Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Self Harm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drug Issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sensory Impairment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Eating Disorder	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Single Homeless	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HIV/AIDS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tenancy Breakdown	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Homeless Family	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Teenage Parent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Independent Living Skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Traveller	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Young person at risk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mental Health concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Welfare Benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mental Health diagnosis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			

Single homeless is a category here but rough sleeper isn't.

The categories are divided into 4 areas which reflect the areas of focus for the four members of staff providing the assessment and referrals:

- mental health
- substance misuse
- probation
- teenage pregnancy

Rough sleepers are not categorised in the Start Plus waiting list or assessment criteria. The Start Plus manager did say that gathering statistics for verified rough sleepers had been discussed at a meeting with Jenny Dunne, previous lead on rough sleeping at the council, on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2013 but this has not yet been implemented.

Some providers expressed concerns over the quality of referrals from Start Plus principally for two reasons.

One is the lack of referrals. Livingstone House is running with 10% voids and the landlord has lost sufficient money as a result that they are considering withdrawing from the borough.

Several providers also expressed concern that referral forms from Start Plus often miss crucial information, for example, the risk may state 'danger to others' yet the comments box will be empty. Without this information the project cannot accept the risk of accepting the referral. Some providers felt that the expectation is that they will carry out a proper assessment while Start Plus just carries out a basic one.

## DATA COLLECTION

The quality and consistency of data collection on rough sleepers in the borough via Streelink and CHAIN could be improved. This would enable both providers and the Council to have a better understanding of who is on the streets, what their needs are, who is in the hostels and what their move-on requirements will be.

An example of this is the fact that basic move-on data for the hostels could not be supplied in any meaningful form for the preparation of this report by the provider or the council.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Recommendation 1: Brent commits to the ending rough sleeping pledge**

With the extent of the increase of rough sleeping it is clear there needs to be strong strategic leadership from within the local authority and a concerted focus on rough sleeping throughout the borough. This should be led by a dedicated post of Rough Sleeping Coordinator.

1. No one should spend a second night out – Effective outreach work to identify people quickly and within 1<sup>st</sup> stage services; there should be assessment beds for short-term stays, to be used as emergency resource, offer severe weather provision and for out-of-hours placements.
2. No one should return to the streets once helped off – through the development of evictions and abandonment protocol and a pathway
3. No one should live on the streets – effective case conferencing through the providers group
4. People should not arrive on the street – earlier intervention through Housing Options and others on homelessness prevention (use of PrOMPT)

### **Recommendation 2: Develop a rough sleeping pathway in the borough**

- Develop a pathway approach to rough sleeping in the borough using PROMPT, MOPP and support of HL Regional Managers who can provide examples from other boroughs.
- Add Rough Sleeper as an area of focus alongside existing 4 (mental health, substance misuse, probation and teenage pregnancy) with a flag system to ensure appropriate priority is given to rough sleepers.
- Develop or enhance the Prevention Strategy using PrOMPT as above.

### **Recommendation 3: Improve capacity and performance of the outreach team by:**

- Arranging at least one shift per week that starts earlier
- Increasing the length of shifts to enable more interaction
- Ensuring a map is provided on the business card
- Considering use of single fare bus tickets (saver tickets are available from TFL to charities)
- Ensuring outreach workers explain and promote services available from day centre e.g. food, showers, clothing
- Considering booking appointments on the spot for the rough sleeper to attend
- Agreeing a procedure for recording successful presentations to the day centre and how many times to return to the rough sleeper if they do not present
- Facilitate meetings between providers, for example, restarting the Brent Homelessness Forum
- Reconfiguring support provided while people are in NPRS beds to include more than a weekly group session
- Establishing regular communication between outreach teams and hostels
- Reviewing the Streetlink Offer to ensure it is as responsive as possible (support available from Streetlink team)

### **Recommendation 4: Improve functioning of Hostels and referrals**

- The council should ensure they engage with Riverside ECHG to avoid losing a much needed resource in the borough. This would include as mentioned above establishing regular communication and improved referral procedures.
- Ensure throughput data is collected and analysed regularly to support contract management and limit voids.

- Consider better use of space within hostels and an increased provision of education, training and employment activities within the hostels in support of the Places of Change ethos.
- Establish regular communication between hostels and outreach team. Hostels to inform outreach team of voids.
- Assess referral procedures to Livingstone House to ensure referrers are aware of alternative provision with DePaul
- Facilitate a referral process between St Mungo's and Pound Lane and Livingstone House.

**Recommendation 5: Improve joint working across services to enable the best support for all clients**

- Introduction of a common information-sharing agreement alongside the common assessment or triage process. Potential model attached as Appendix 2
- Consideration should be given to reviewing existing meetings and forums and introducing a single 'provider meeting' structure that is split to have a strategic focus as well as a 'task and targeting' approach to individual client cases
- Service specifications should be amended to clarify the expectations for service providers and improve the council's ability to assure quality of services, as well as strengthening commissioning processes.
- Services should be required to collect data on who is using their services and provide this on request
- Regular joint training should take place to ensure staff changes do not negatively impact on the quality of the pathway and assessments (and to update on changes in provision) and improve joint working and communication between providers and everyone carrying out assessments.
- All staff working with rough sleepers and single homeless people in the borough should understand a common definition of both of these terms
- An electronic client recording system would be a beneficial tool for information sharing and monitoring and for implementing protocols around prioritisation and access.

2012

# Equality Analysis Guidance and Form



## Brent Council Equality Analysis Form

Please contact the Corporate Diversity team before completing this form. The form is to be used for both predictive Equality Analysis and any reviews of existing policies and practices that may be carried out.

Once you have completed this form, please forward to the Corporate Diversity Team for auditing. Make sure you allow sufficient time for this.

<b>1. Roles and Responsibilities:</b> please refer to stage 1 of the guidance	
<p><b>Directorate:</b> Regeneration &amp; Growth</p> <p><b>Service Area:</b> Housing Needs Service</p>	<p><b>Person Responsible:</b> Name: Adam Salmon Title: Street Population Coordinator Contact No: 020 8937 2459 Signed: Adam J S</p> <p>almon</p>
<p><b>Name of policy:</b> Rough Sleepers' Support Services Retendering</p>	<p><b>Date analysis started:</b> 16/05/14</p> <p><b>Completion date:</b> 30/05/14</p> <p><b>Review date:</b></p>
<p><b>Is the policy:</b>  New <input type="checkbox"/> Old <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Auditing Details:</b> Name: Elizabeth Bryan Title: Equality Officer Date : 30/05/14 Contact No:0208 937 1190 Signed:</p>
<p><b>Signing Off Manager:</b> responsible for review and monitoring Name: Fidelis Ukweno Title: Service Manager, Housing Options Date: 30/05/14 Contact No: 020 8937 4219 Signed:</p>	<p><b>Decision Maker:</b> Name individual /group/meeting/ committee:  Date:</p>



**2. Brief description of the policy. Describe the aim and purpose of the policy, what needs or duties is it designed to meet? How does it differ from any existing policy or practice in this area?**

Please refer to stage 2 of the guidance.

This equalities analysis is on the retendering of Brent's Rough Sleepers' Support Services as the current contract expired at the end of March 2014, we have extended the contract with the current provider to cover the period of time it will take to retender the service, it is anticipated that the service will be put out to tender, at the latest, by the beginning of July 2014, so that it can be completed by the end of August 2014, so that the new contact can be mobilised in time to start from 06/10/14.

The existing service is provided by Ashford Place (previously Cricklewood Homeless Concern). It is commissioned to deliver outreach shifts, where outreach workers go out on the streets to find and meet with people sleeping rough to conduct an initial assessment of them and establish a relationship with them, so that they can then introduce them to the other commissioned component of the service, the building based resettlement team, which works with rough sleepers to take them off of the streets and resettle them into stable accommodation.

Currently the service is commissioned as a single, unified, Rough Sleepers' Outreach and Resettlement service, with funding for four FTE posts, with no stipulation for how hours/resources should be allocated to the Outreach or Resettlement components of the service. It is intended to recommission the service as two separate lots that might be commissioned from the same or different providers, with funding for two FTE posts allocated to the Outreach lot and funding for two FTE posts allocated to the Housing Advice and Resettlement lot. This change in the structure of how the service is commissioned is both to better ensure an appropriate split in the allocation of resources between outreach and housing advice and resettlement and to maximise the potential for providers to present innovative proposals for how to maximise the impact of the available resources.

The principal aims of the Rough Sleepers' Support Service scheme are to:

- Meet and engage with rough sleepers.
- Work proactively with rough sleepers to resettle them, through the provision of a structured Rough Sleepers Resettlement Pathway, into suitable stable accommodation, including, where appropriate, reconnection to their home country/area.
- Work with rough sleepers holistically, addressing issues that contributed to their homelessness and impair their ability to maintain stable accommodation once resettled.
- Contribute to community safety and minimise both rough sleeping related anti-social behaviour and its impact on the wider community.

**3. Describe how the policy will impact on all of the protected groups:**



The primary goals of the Rough Sleepers' Support Service are to ensure that, irrespective of age, disability, gender, race, religious belief, sexual orientation, pregnancy or gender identity, rough sleepers are rapidly made contact with, engaged and assisted off the streets and into accommodation.

#### Age

Rough sleepers will not be discriminated against because of their age. Analysis indicates that the greatest number of people contacted sleeping rough in Brent are aged 26-35 (37%) (87 individuals), followed by the age groups 36-45 (24%) (57 individuals), 18-25 (19%) (43 individuals) 46-55 (15%) (35 individuals) and 55+ (5%) (11 individuals). These figures are comparable to the demographic of rough sleepers in other boroughs

#### Disability

We have no data on this protected characteristic with respect to rough sleepers as this information isn't recorded on CHAIN ( the Combined Homeless and Information Network database). To ensure that rough sleepers supported by the service are not discriminated against on the basis of disability the providers of the retendered services will be required to provide the council with monitoring data on the incidence of disability among service users contacted by the outreach team and supported by the housing advice and resettlement team and the council will review such monitoring data for any evidence of discrimination/barriers to access of services. A particular area of concern is the provision of support for rough sleepers with mental health problems that are severe enough to limit their engagement with support services, but insufficiently severe to make them sectionable under the Mental Health Act. The issue is that community mental health teams in Brent (in common with every other borough) are structured and resourced to primarily work with service users in office hours and from fixed locations, while Community Mental Health Teams have demonstrated a willingness to exercise a degree of flexibility to work alongside outreach workers, outside of their core hours and coming out onto the streets to meet with such clients, there are significant resource limitations that inhibit their ability to do so. This gap in provision, while affecting a very limited number of service users, (no more than 1-2 rough sleepers in the borough at any one time), is nonetheless one which we need to further explore to ensure these people receive equal access to services. Addressing this need will require resources and partnerships that go beyond the scope of the retendering of the Rough Sleepers' Support Service.

#### Gender

Rough sleepers will not be discriminated against because of their gender. Analysis indicates a gender split of the people contacted sleeping rough in Brent of 86% male and 14% female (200 men, 33 women), again these figures are comparable to the demographic of rough sleepers in other boroughs, with the overwhelming majority of rough sleepers being men. As part of their initial assessment of service users both teams will record their reasons for becoming homeless. The council will ask both teams to report on this data as part of their regular monitoring and will review this for evidence of people being made homeless as a result of discrimination or harassment, e.g. victims of domestic violence or hate crimes.

#### Race

The majority of people contacted sleeping rough in Brent in 2012-13 were from BAME households (specifically the Black African community). In 2012-13 42% of contacted rough sleepers from the Black community (African, Caribbean, Somalian, Other) (97 individuals), 38% from the White community (Irish, UK, Other) (88 individuals) and 20% from the Asian community (Indian, Pakistani, Chinese, Other) (46 individuals). Although we don't yet have the year end figures for 2013-14, available data indicates that the demographic distribution of race for rough sleepers in 2013-14 will have been significantly shifted by the large increase in the number EEA (European Economic Area citizen) rough sleepers in the borough. Many of these EEA rough sleepers have restrictions on their entitlement to benefits that significantly limit their options for escaping rough sleeping, often their only option being to accept the assistance offered to return/reconnect them to their country of origin. Many EEA rough sleepers choose to continue to sleep rough rather than accept offers of reconnection. It is deemed likely that this situation will be further exacerbated by the further restriction on entitlement to JSA and Housing Benefit introduced by the changes in regulations that came into force on the 01/04/14. Brent is participating in a dialogue between the rough sleeping leads of the London boroughs to explore innovative responses to the envisaged increase in the number of EEA citizens who sleep rough as a result of these benefit entitlement changes, these include greater cooperation with these citizens' governments' representatives in London to explore what services can be developed for them and low cost, minimal provision of accommodation, that could be provided with entitlement to housing benefits. Such initiatives will not be without their challenges and we are at the very early stages of exploring them.

#### Religious Belief

We have no data on this protected characteristic with respect to rough sleepers as this information isn't recorded on CHAIN. To ensure that rough sleepers supported by the service are not discriminated against on the basis of their religious belief the providers of the retendered services will be required to provide the council with monitoring data on the religious belief of service users contacted by the outreach team and supported by the housing advice and resettlement team and the council will review such monitoring data for any evidence of discrimination/ barriers to access of services.

#### Sexual Orientation

We have no data on this protected characteristic with respect to rough sleepers as this information isn't recorded on CHAIN. To ensure that rough sleepers supported by the service are not discriminated against on the basis of sexual orientation the providers of the retendered services will be required to provide the council with monitoring data on the sexual orientation of service users contacted by the outreach team and supported by the housing advice and resettlement team and the council will review such monitoring data for any evidence of discrimination/ barriers to access of services. Providers will also be expected to develop links with local LGBT services to enhance their capacity to meet the particular needs of LGBT service users.

#### Pregnancy and Maternity

We have no data on this protected characteristic with respect to rough sleepers as this information isn't recorded on CHAIN. The primary reason for this is that as

pregnant women or parents with dependant children are a priority housing need group to whom there is a statutory duty, they very rarely sleep rough/make contact with rough sleeping services. The expectation would be that where the Rough Sleepers' Support Service did encounter a pregnant woman or parents with dependent children they would actively put them in touch with statutory services and, if appropriate, make a safeguarding referral.

#### Gender Identity

We have no data on this protected characteristic with respect to rough sleepers as this information isn't recorded on CHAIN. In the wider context the Housing Needs Department has recognised that it both needs to review the monitoring data it collects on transgendered applicants and its service offer to this service user group to ensure that it is best meeting their needs and ensuring they do not experience discrimination. The Rough Sleeping Support Service will be included in this wider review to ensure that rough sleepers are not discriminated against on the basis of their gender identity. To ensure that rough sleepers supported by the service are not discriminated against on the basis of gender identity the providers of the retendered services will be required to provide the council with monitoring data on the gender identity of service users contacted by the outreach team and supported by the housing advice and resettlement team and the council will review such monitoring data for any evidence of discrimination/ barriers to access of services.

#### **Please give details of the evidence you have used:**

The information the above analysis is based on was abstracted from the CHAIN database and CHAIN's 2012-13 annual report on rough sleeping in Brent. We had to rely on the 2012-13 report as the 2013-14 report will not be available until 30/06/14.

#### **4. Describe how the policy will impact on the Council's duty to have due regard to the need to:**

##### **(a) Eliminate discrimination (including indirect discrimination), harassment and victimisation;**

Brent's stated commitment to Equality and Diversity in procurement clearly states the commitment we expect from providers to promote equality and diversity, taking into account the needs of the people protected under the Equality Act 2010 in respect of the Protected Characteristics. The evaluation of bidding provider's tender submissions for the Rough Sleepers' Support Service will include a critical assessment of their demonstrable commitment to actively promoting diversity and equality.

The specification of the Rough Sleepers Support Service contract/s will include a requirement that bidders demonstrate their competence and experience to deliver the service by providing examples of how they have successfully delivered

equivalent outreach and support services, including examples of linking and partnering with community or specialist services that demonstrate the providers awareness of how and ability to draw on their relationships with these services to better enable the generic outreach service they deliver to meet the specific needs of disadvantaged and potentially discriminated against groups. This would include provision of support for the LGBT community, people with substance misuse issues and/or engaged in prostitution and the provision of language and culturally sensitive support for immigrants who have a first language other than English and may be unfamiliar with the social structures and institutions of the United Kingdom. The panel will also assess providers' bids to ensure they recruit appropriate staff, including ensuring that they are DBS checked.

Providers will also be contractually required to have a complaints procedure that as well as providing service users with a formal mechanism for expressing any concerns they may have about the service they receive will also contribute to preventing unlawful discrimination and promoting equal opportunities/access for all. In the event of service users having queries or complaints in relation to providers' conduct with regard to issues of discrimination or fair access to services Brent Council will provide advice and assistance to the enquirer/ complainant to ensure a timely and satisfactory resolution.

The number of complaints will be one of the performance indicators upon which providers' performance is monitored. All complaints of harassment or discrimination will be dealt with by the Provider in the first instance in line with their complaints procedure. Where the service user is not satisfied with the outcome, they will then able to contact Brent's Street Population Coordinator the council officer responsible for managing this contract.

Regular performance monitoring will allow the Council to ensure there is a consistent approach to complaints and that support is being provided with a caring and responsive approach with regards to complaints of harassment.

**(b) Advance equality of opportunity;**

People who have to resort to sleeping rough, irrespective of the other challenges or disadvantages they face, are some of the most excluded and marginalised members of society. In addressing their needs and supporting them to access accommodation and escape from rough sleeping this service will advance equality of opportunity. The overriding priority of the retendering of this service is to incorporate the recommendations of the Rough Sleepers Needs Analysis conducted for Brent by Homeless Link, the principle objectives of these recommendations being the refocusing of the service's street based outreach practise and the asserting of a stronger and more responsive rough sleepers resettlement pathway. While neither of these actions are specifically targeted at advancing the equality of opportunity for protected groups, these groups will, like all others, benefit from the envisaged improvement in the service that the retendering is intended to deliver.

**(c) Foster good relations**

In addressing the needs of rough sleepers and reducing the numbers of people

rough sleeping across the borough these services will also reduce the incidence of rough sleeping related anti-social behaviour and the impact rough sleeping can have on the public domain and wider environment, in doing so improving the economic, social and environmental well-being of the wider community and fostering good relations.

**5. What engagement activity did you carry out as part of your assessment?**  
Please refer to stage 3 of the guidance.

**i. Who did you engage with?**

The retendering of this service has been informed by an external Needs Analysis for Rough Sleepers that the council commissioned Homeless Link to conduct on its behalf. As an integral part of this Needs Analysis the consultant Homeless Link employed met with a wide range of stakeholders including the current service provider, Lift, a local user led homelessness charity, the boroughs supported housing providers and specialist rough sleeping services, such as No Second Night Out and London Street Rescue that interact with Brent rough sleepers and rough sleeping services as part of their broader pan-london services. The consultant also joined an outreach shift and consulted with service users directly. As the previous director on the Places of Change programme and other central government rough sleeping initiatives the consultant was both expert in issues of rough sleeping and experienced in interacting directly with service users. As this piece of work conducted as recently as November 2013 it was felt that a further consultation process would repeat much of the work undertaken in the Needs Analysis and as such would both represent a poor allocation of resources and needlessly delay the tendering process.

**ii. What methods did you use?**

An externally commissioned needs analysis.

**iii. What did you find out?**

Primarily the need to review Brent's Rough Sleeping Pathway and the manner/speed with which rough sleepers access accommodation, a piece of work which is being conducted in parallel with the retendering of the Rough Sleepers' Support Service and an understanding that, going forward, commissioning the street outreach and housing advice and resettlement elements of the Rough Sleeping Support Services as two separate contracts, with separate service specifications and performance indicators would ensure that each service was allocated the resources intended and tighten each service's focus on delivering the specific area of work they were commissioned to deliver.

**iv. How have you used the information gathered?**

To inform the revised structure of the way these services are commissioned.

**v. How has it affected your policy?**

It has resulted in us separately specifying the two elements of the service, with separate service specifications, with the aim of tightening the focus of each element on their specific remits/roles.

**6. Have you identified a negative impact on any protected group, or identified any unmet needs/requirements that affect specific protected groups? If so, explain what actions you have undertaken, including consideration of any alternative proposals, to lessen or mitigate against this impact.**

Please refer to stage 2, 3 & 4 of the guidance.

It is recognised that provision for rough sleepers with mental health problems that are severe enough to prevent their full engagement with services, but insufficiently severe to make them sectionable under the Mental Health Act could be improved. The issue is that community mental health teams in Brent (in common with every other borough) are structured and resourced to primarily work with service users in office hours and from fixed locations, while Community Mental Health Teams have demonstrated a willingness to exercise a degree of flexibility to work alongside outreach workers, outside of their core hours and coming out onto the streets to meet with such clients, there are significant resource limitations that inhibit their ability to do so. This situation will not be made any worse by the retendering of these services, but the new provider of the outreach service will be required to review how this element of the service offer could, within the limited available resources, be improved.

We also recognise that the resettlement options that can be offered to EEA rough sleepers are severely limited as a consequence of the restrictions on their entitlement to JSA and Housing Benefit, meaning often the only service offer available to them is return/reconnection to their home country. Our experience is that many EEA rough sleepers, despite their only alternative being to sleep rough, refuse this offer. This does result in EEA rough sleepers experiencing more prolonged rough sleeping as compared to other rough sleepers who are entitled to JSA and Housing Benefit.

**Please give details of the evidence you have used:**

Examples of practise/casework with current rough sleepers with these mental health needs.

**7. Analysis summary**

Please tick boxes to summarise the findings of your analysis.

<b>Protected Group</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Adverse</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
------------------------	-----------------	----------------	----------------

	impact	impact	
<b>Age</b>			X
<b>Disability</b>		x	
<b>Gender re-assignment</b>			X
<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>			X
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>			X
<b>Race</b>		X	
<b>Religion or belief</b>			X
<b>Sex</b>			X
<b>Sexual orientation</b>			X

### 8. The Findings of your Analysis

Please complete whichever of the following sections is appropriate (one only). Please refer to stage 4 of the guidance.

#### No major change

The tender terms will ensure that all rough sleepers accessing the service will receive the best possible support in accordance with their individual needs and requirements.

The tender process will also include method statements which allow the panel to assess how well the provider/s are able to meet the needs of those sleeping rough in the borough. Bidders will be required to demonstrate their experience by providing examples of how they have successfully delivered equivalent outreach and support services. Particular attention will be paid to examples of anti-discriminatory practise and examples of linking and partnering with community or specialist services that demonstrate the providers awareness of how and ability to draw on their relationships with these services to better enable the generic outreach service they deliver to meet the specific needs of disadvantaged and potentially discriminated against groups, especially with regard to the protected groups. The panel will also assess provider's bids to ensure they recruit appropriate staff, including ensuring that they are DBS checked.

The tender specification will also include Brent's commitment to Equality and Diversity in Procurement and will state clearly the commitment we expect from providers to promote equality and diversity, taking into account the needs of the people protected under the Equality Act 2010 in respect of the protected characteristics.

Regular performance monitoring, in the form of monthly targeting and tasking meetings and formal quarterly reviews will allow the Council to ensure that the service is delivered in a manner that promotes Equality and Diversity, is consistent with best practice and provided with a caring and responsive approach with regards to service users needs.

**Adjust the policy**

*This may involve making changes to the policy to remove barriers or to better advance equality. It can mean introducing measures to mitigate the potential adverse effect on a particular protected group(s).*

*Remember that it is lawful under the Equality Act to treat people differently in some circumstances, where there is a need for it. It is both lawful and a requirement of the public sector equality duty to consider if there is a need to treat disabled people differently, including more favourable treatment where necessary.*

*If you have identified mitigating measures that would remove a negative impact, please detail those measures below.*

*Please document below the reasons for your conclusion, the information that you used to make this decision and how you plan to adjust the policy.*

**Continue the policy**

*This means adopting your proposals, despite any adverse effect or missed opportunities to advance equality, provided you have satisfied yourself that it does not amount to unlawfully discrimination, either direct or indirect discrimination.*

*In cases where you believe discrimination is not unlawful because it is objectively justified, it is particularly important that you record what the objective justification is for continuing the policy, and how you reached this decision.*

*Explain the countervailing factors that outweigh any adverse effects on equality as set out above:*

*Please document below the reasons for your conclusion and the information that you used to make this decision:*



### **Stop and remove the policy**

*If there are adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated, and if the policy is not justified by countervailing factors, you should consider stopping the policy altogether. If a policy shows unlawful discrimination it must be removed or changed.*

*Please document below the reasons for your conclusion and the information that you used to make this decision.*

### **9. Monitoring and review**

Please provide details of how you intend to monitor the policy in the future. Please refer to stage 7 of the guidance.

As well as monthly targeting and tasking meetings there will be on-going performance monitoring via quarterly contract meetings with Providers and by review of reported their KPIs. The number of complaints will also be used as a monitoring mechanism to ensure service users have been treated fairly and have not experienced discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin, age, gender, faith, sexuality and disability.

Brent Council is committed to the principle of equal opportunities in the delivery of all of its services. Brent Council will seek to ensure that the Rough Sleepers' Support Service is delivered in a manner that is fair to all sections of the community regardless of nationality, ethnic origin, marital status, age, gender or disability.

Brent Council and its partners will be responsive, accessible and sensitive to the needs of all rough sleepers, irrespective of nationality, ethnic origin, marital status, age, gender or disability, will not tolerate prejudice and discrimination and will actively promote equality.

The Rough Sleepers' Support Service provider/s will record client contact data on CHAIN, an online database used across London by rough sleeping and outreach services. CHAIN monitors the demographics of engaged rough sleepers by ethnicity, nationality, age and gender. The provider/s will need to monitor for faith, sexuality, disability, pregnancy, marital status and gender identity by other means. Diversity data will be examined with providers as an integral part of contract management to ensure that the service does not operate in a manner that disadvantages or discriminates against any group/s of service users.


### **10. Action plan and outcomes**

At Brent, we want to make sure that our equality monitoring and analysis results in positive outcomes for our colleagues and customers.

Use the table below to record any actions we plan to take to address inequality, barriers or opportunities identified in this analysis.

Action	By when	Lead officer	Desired outcome	Date completed	Actual outcome
Establish working group to establish better local partnerships to better meet the needs of rough sleepers with complex mental health needs.	Within six weeks of the mobilisation of the new Rough Sleepers' Support Service contract.	Street Population Coordinator.	Better arrangements to meet the needs of rough sleepers with these needs significantly outside of the usual operating hours of community mental health services and meeting with them on street based outreach sessions.		

Please forward to the Corporate Diversity Team for auditing.

 <p><b>Brent</b></p>	<p><b>Cabinet</b> <b>16 June 2014</b></p> <p><b>Report from the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth</b></p>
<p>For Action <span style="float: right;">Wards affected Brondesbury Park</span></p>	
<p><b>Disposal of loft space at 96 Leighton Gardens, London NW10 3PU</b></p>	

\*Appendix 1 is not for publication.

## **1.0 SUMMARY**

1.1 This report seeks approval to proceed with the disposal of the Council's loft space within the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) at 96 Leighton Gardens, London NW10 3PU for a capital receipt.

## **2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 That Members approve the disposal of the Council's loft space at 96 Leighton Gardens to the leaseholder on the first floor flat at 96B Leighton Gardens (the top floor flat which adjoins the loft space), for a capital receipt.

2.2 That Members delegate authority to the Operational Director of Property and Projects to agree the terms of the disposal and grant a supplementary lease for the sale of the loft space.

## **3.0 DETAIL**

3.1 The Council receives a number of enquiries each year from leaseholders in street properties within the HRA wishing to acquire the undemised areas of land or property above or neighbouring their flats in order to extend their existing flats.

- 3.2 No formal written policy or framework is currently in place to deal with these types of leaseholder enquiries. Instead, each case is reviewed on a case by case basis and in the context of the practical, legal and technical reasons in relation to each property.
- 3.3 The Council is not legally required to dispose of areas of land and property which are not demised, such as loft spaces and basements, to adjoining leaseholders, however there is the potential to generate capital receipts for the Council from these types of disposals and potentially allow development to take place to increase the number of habitable rooms in the borough.
- 3.4 When an enquiry is received from a leaseholder wishing to acquire an undemised area of land or property, the Council will consult with Brent Housing Partnership (BHP), who manages the properties, about the feasibility of the disposal and set out the procedure and timescale for investigating whether we would be agreeable to the sale to the leaseholder.
- 3.5 The Council may agree in principle to the disposal except in the case where we would wish to retain the undemised areas of land or property within the HRA, or if there are other practical or technical reasons against the disposal. It must be emphasised that each case must be viewed on its own facts and merits because of the legal and technical complexities inherent in some property ownership structures.
- 3.6 The Council or BHP will carry out a valuation to assess the amount of premium we would seek for the disposal of the undemised area of land or property. The valuation may take into account any potential development value. In addition to the premium payable, the leaseholder will be required to pay any legal or surveyor fees incurred by the Council in relation to the transaction.
- 3.7 If the premium and costs being sought is agreed with the leaseholder and the necessary approvals obtained by the Council, a deed of variation will be executed which will include the undemised area of land or property in the lease. The offer is generally conditional on the leaseholder obtaining the necessary licence for alteration, planning, building regulations and any other consent that may be necessary for development.
- 3.8 The subject property is a maisonette comprising two self-contained flats. The Council owns the freehold of the property. The ground floor flat at 96A Leighton Gardens is owned by the Council and is let to a secure tenant.
- 3.9 The first floor flat at 96B Leighton Gardens is privately owned and comprises two bedrooms (approximately 786 square feet). The gross internal floor area of the adjoining loft space (shown in appendix 2) is approximately 505 square feet. The combination of the roof space with the first floor flat is possible and the additional accommodation from such a scheme could comprise a double bedroom with en suite bathroom.

- 3.10 In the case of the subject property, Council officers have reviewed the case with Brent Housing Partnership and have agreed in principle to the disposal of the loft space to the leaseholder who owns the first floor flat. The proposed disposal only includes the loft space shown in appendix 2 and excludes the roof over the lower back addition of the main building.
- 3.11 Bearing in mind that an additional bedroom is likely to increase the value of the property, the resulting estimated net increase in value (gross profit less development costs) is divided equally between the parties to arrive at a valuation for the disposal. The premium being sought by the Council which has been agreed by the leaseholder subject to contract is shown in appendix 1.
- 3.12 It is assumed that the leaseholder has satisfied himself that full planning consent would be available for his proposed use and the Council's valuation is on that basis.
- 3.13 The deed of variation will set out the new ownership details and responsibility for the management and maintenance of the roof and loft space under the new arrangements. It is generally a condition of sale that when a loft area under the main roof is sold that the purchaser takes on the full responsibility of the whole roof.
- 3.14 The proposed loft space is entirely over the subject flat and there is little risk posed to the occupier of the ground floor flat. However, it will be necessary for the leaseholder to obtain the Council's consent for any technical work and the precise construction detail of any redevelopment, particularly where such work may have an impact on the ground floor flat.

#### 4.0 **Options Appraisal**

##### *Recommended option*

##### Option 1 – Dispose of the loft space to the adjoining first floor leaseholder (special purchaser) at an open market valuation, for a capital receipt

- 4.1 The loft space is currently vacant and can only be accessed through the adjoining first floor flat which is privately owned and this is therefore a strong factor in favour of disposal.
- 4.2 The disposal will provide a capital receipt for the Council and this is a strong factor in favour of disposal.
- 4.3 Regular maintenance expenditure on specific building elements will be passed to the leaseholder and this is a strong factor in favour of disposal.

*The discounted options are shown below*

##### Option 2 – Do nothing

4.4 The current loft space is not being utilised. The disposal of the loft space will provide for an additional habitable room for the borough if the loft space is subsequently redeveloped by the purchaser.

4.5 Option 3 - Open market sale

Not applicable as the loft space can only be accessed by the adjoining leaseholder of the first floor flat and could not be reasonably sold to any other purchaser. However, the premium being sought is based on an open market value and therefore satisfies the best consideration requirement.

## **5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The estimated gross capital receipt on disposal is given in Appendix 1.

5.2 There is no annual rent loss to the HRA under the proposal.

5.3 The Council's transaction costs for the disposal to be covered by the leaseholder.

5.4 The Council's general policy is that receipts arising from the disposal of land and properties are used to support the overall capital programme.

## **6.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 Under Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 the Council has a general power to dispose of properties including by way of the sale of the freehold or the grant of a lease. The essential condition is that the Council obtains (unless it is a lease for 7 years or less) the best consideration that is reasonably obtainable.

6.2 Disposal at market value to the leaseholder of the first floor flat will satisfy the best consideration requirement.

6.3 Where the leasehold flat is extended by a loft space then the parties execute a deed of variation to the existing lease. The term of the existing lease will not be extended.

6.4 The proposed transaction is 'without prejudice' and subject to contract'.

## **7.0 DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 There are no diversity implications directly arising from this proposal as the loft space being sold is currently unused and vacant.

## **8.0 STAFFING/ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 As per main body of the report.

## **9.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Appendix 1: Valuation and premium [below the line]  
Appendix 2: Loft plan

**Contact Officers**

Denish Patel  
Project Manager  
Regeneration and Growth  
020 8937 2529

Sarah Chaudhry  
Head of Strategic Property  
Regeneration and Growth  
020 8937 1705

**Andy Donald**  
**Strategic Director of Regeneration and Growth**

# 96B Leighton Gardens, London, NW10 3PU

## Disposal of Loft Space



**Brent**

**Premises shown cross hatched black.**

**1:500**

Plan to stated scale if printed at A4.

PSMA OS copyright statement

© Crown copyright and database rights 2014 Ordnance Survey 100025260

OS Open data copyright statement:

Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2014

NORTH






By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

 <p><b>Brent</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Cabinet</b> <b>16 June 2014</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Report from the Chief Executive</b></p>
<p>For Action</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Wards Affected: All</p>
<p><b>Brent Education Commission Report</b> <b>Ambitious for all: Sharing responsibility</b></p>	

## 1.0 SUMMARY

The Council commissioned a review of education in Brent to see how progress and performance might be accelerated for children and young people in schools. This review was chaired by the interim chief executive of Brent Council working with three other independent members. The report of the Commission is attached for consideration by the Cabinet.

## 2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Cabinet notes the findings of Brent's Education Commission.
- 2.2 That the Cabinet asks the lead member responsible for Children and Young People and the Strategic Director, Children and Young People, to consider the recommendations in detail and bring back a report in September with an action plan based on those recommendations that are accepted and are being taken forward.

## 3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Given the magnitude of the changes happening in the school sector, Brent Council to set up the Brent Education Commission to review education in the borough and to make recommendations for development. The overall aim of the Commission has been to build on existing effective practice, to identify areas of concern and to enhance the extent to which schools and academies learn from each other, so that every school succeeds, every child thrives and performance in Brent schools is accelerated.
- 3.2 Educationally, Brent outperforms local authorities nationally but not those in London, where it is close to the average. Many other London boroughs are performing better, including some with higher levels of deprivation. The Commission report looks at the possible reasons for Brent's poorer performance and makes a number of recommendations for improvement.

**3.3** The Council is ambitious for change and key local stakeholders agree on the need for a new approach that responds to the changing educational landscape. The Report outlines the need to develop education strategy and leadership in Brent so it better fits the changing landscape. It also identifies five areas where change is necessary and suggests areas for development in:

- Planning schools places
- knowing Brent schools
- Promoting and supporting school –to-school networks
- Providing challenge to address weaknesses
- Improving school governance

#### **4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The only direct financial implications from this report are the cost of support for partnership initiatives with schools. These costs will be found from within current resources.

#### **5.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The local authority has a statutory duty to promote high standards in schools.

#### **6.0 DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

This report considers the performance of underperforming groups and underperforming schools. The Commission Report is intended to address inequalities and improve performance.

#### **7.0 STAFFING/ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS (IF APPROPRIATE)**

None

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Education in Brent, Ambitious for all: a shared responsibility  
Brent Education Commission Report, March 2014

#### **CONTACT OFFICERS**

Christine Gilbert, Chief Executive  
[Christine.gilbert@brent.gov.uk](mailto:Christine.gilbert@brent.gov.uk) 020 8937 1007

 <b>Brent</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CABINET</b> 16 June 2014</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Report from the Chief Finance Officer</b></p>
<p>For Action <span style="float: right;">Wards Affected: ALL</span></p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AUTHORITY TO TENDER CONTRACT FOR INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICES</b></p>	

Appendix 1 is Not for Publication

## **1. Summary**

- 1.1 This report concerns the provision of outsourced internal audit services from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. This report requests approval to invite tenders in respect of internal audit services as required by Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89.

## **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 The Cabinet to approve inviting tenders for internal audit services on the basis of the pre - tender considerations set out in paragraph 3.29 of the report.
- 2.2 The Cabinet to give approval to officers to evaluate the tenders referred to in 2.1 above on the basis of the evaluation criteria set out in paragraph 3.29 of the report.

## **3. Detail**

### **Purpose**

- 3.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval to invite tenders for the provision of a four year contract for internal audit services to the council from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. This follows expiry of the current contract with the London Borough of Croydon on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015.
- 3.2 The services to be provided are core internal audit services, including the audit of schools, establishments, key financial systems and specialist audit areas including IT and contract audits.

### **Current Provision**

- 3.3 The current provision is via a contract with the London Borough of Croydon. This

contract was approved by the Executive at its meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> February 2013<sup>1</sup> and runs from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015. The gross cost of the existing contract over the two year period is estimated to be £604,000. The council recovers some £120,000 over the two year period from Brent Housing Partnership relating to planned audit work purchased under the contract.

- 3.4 The council had previously contracted with the London Borough of Croydon for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013. In both instances the council entered into a two year contract in order that it could review its position should the market or the council's requirements change.
- 3.5 The London Borough of Croydon entered into a framework agreement (the "Croydon Framework") with Deloitte and Touche Public Sector Internal Audit Ltd ("Deloitte") and are able to call off from the Croydon Framework a variable number of days per annum, in order to service the contract with Brent. Deloitte and Touche Public Sector Internal Audit were sold to Mazars on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2014. The name has since been changed to Mazars Public Sector Internal Audit (Mazars).
- 3.6 The Croydon Framework commenced in April 2008 with an initial term to expire on 31 March 2015. There was however an option to extend the term of the Croydon Framework and it now runs until 31<sup>st</sup> March 2018. There are currently 25 local authorities buying into the Croydon contract, including 12 in London. Approximately 12,000 days were called off in 2013/14.
- 3.7 The rationale for entering into this contract in 2013 was documented in the earlier report to the Executive<sup>1</sup>. The decision in 2013 followed an earlier decision to contract with Croydon in 2011. On both occasions, when entering the contract, there was an option to contract for a period of four years. There was no financial advantage in doing so and the Executive agreed to a two year contract on the basis that it would provide an opportunity to review the situation over a shorter time frame.
- 3.8 The contract has been delivered using staff from Deloitte, now Mazars. This has provided a degree of continuity and has enabled senior staff to become familiar with the systems and structures within the council.
- 3.9 An audit plan is established for each year. This is drafted in conjunction with Departmental Directors and is approved by CMT and the Audit Committee. For 2014/15 this has been set at 1,200 days. The council uses a mix of a small in-house resource to deliver 295 days with 905 days delivered by the contractor. The contract price is based upon daily rates for different types of audit work.
- 3.10 The day rates within the current contract vary slightly depending upon the volumes called off the whole contract and are adjusted annually for inflation although there has been no increase for the year 2014/15. The current contract allows for flexibility in the number of days procured. The contractor only receives payment for completed audit work.
- 3.11 The in-house team and Mazars' staff are co-located within the Civic Centre and service provision is relatively seamless with a common approach to audit and reporting. Mazars have a manager based on-site who manages the output of Mazars' staff. The council's Internal Audit Manager has day to day oversight of the contract, manages the sole in-house internal auditor and conducts a number of individual audit assignments, delivering 95 chargeable days. The Internal Audit Manager reports to the Head of Audit and Investigation.

### **Options for 2015 onwards**

- 3.12 Given the Croydon contract has been renewed on two occasions with a view to considering market conditions after each 2 year period, officers consider that it is an appropriate time to test the market to establish whether a reduced price / increased effectiveness can be achieved. This is due to a perception that there may be increased interest from the private sector audit in delivering services to local government and that audit techniques, such as continuous auditing methodologies, may present options for efficiency savings.
- 3.13 There are a number of options for the provision from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. Under the existing model of provision, the key determinant of the cost of the contract is the number of days being procured. Under current arrangements, the council determines the audit plan and procures the relevant number of days from the contractor. An alternate model is to ask the contractor to provide a single price to develop and deliver an audit plan to provide adequate coverage to give assurance to the council that internal controls are effective and operating. Under such a model the council has less control over the audit plan or the level of resource devoted to the plan but might receive a lower price.
- 3.14 Under any outsourced option the mix of in-house and outsourced resource could be varied from no in-house provision to minimal outsourcing (necessary to cover computer / contract or other specialist audit). Whilst it is cheaper to deliver core audit services using in-house staff, the council would carry the risk of non-delivery of the audit plan if there were any unforeseen sickness or performance issues and would be less able to flex the service to reflect changing council structures without incurring redundancy and recruitment costs. Therefore, the proposal is to continue with an outsourced service as a replacement of the element of the service currently provided through the Croydon contract.
- 3.15 Given the pressure to reduce support service costs, it is likely that the council will seek a lower level of audit provision in future years. Given the council's expenditure and, potentially range of services, is shrinking it is considered appropriate, to assume that plan days will reduce for 2015/16 and future years. Any contract needs to provide flexibility regarding the number of audit days procured, although these normally need to be agreed at the commencement of the year with the contractor. For the purposes of cost calculations, coverage has been set at 1,000 days per annum, although this should not be seen as a guaranteed minimum or maximum level.
- 3.16 Tendering a new contract will provide an opportunity for the council to test the market for new methodologies. Officers are mindful of the need to adapt audit techniques and there may be opportunities to achieve cost saving or increased effectiveness through the use of new techniques.

### **Option 1 - Extend Croydon Framework**

- 3.17 The council could renew its contract with Croydon for 1, 2 or 3 years. The shorter the period, the more flexibility the council would have should the market change or contractor performance become an issue. The market has remained relatively stable for the past four years and, although there is no material financial benefit in opting for a longer period, a three year commitment would give an indication of stability to Mazars. As a new player in the local authority internal audit market, this may reap some rewards in terms of new approach or products being offered, such as the use of data analytics. The council would only commit annually to a contractual number of planned audit days and would be able to adjust its plans according to need. Costs

would, therefore, be known.

- 3.18 However, there is also no compelling reason not to re-procure the service. Performance has been on the whole, but not always, of a broadly acceptable standard, rather than consistently good. Mazars may improve upon this but the council can have no assurances of this. Conducting a tendering process will help to provide assurance about the quality of future services.

#### **Option 2 - Full in-house service, outsourced IT audit**

- 3.19 Reverting to a full in house service is an option. This would require recruiting to four Internal Audit posts. There is little research available as to the state of the current market for local government internal audit staff as most authorities provide these services through a model broadly similar to Brent's. Experience of recruitment is mixed across London although no one has attempted a large scale exercise. However, given the economic climate and likely downsizing of some internal audit teams, there may be a pool of talented staff available in the run up to April 2015.
- 3.20 However, it is unlikely that the council would be able to attract or retain an in-house computer audit specialist. Therefore, continued outsourcing of IT audit would be required and could be purchased as a separate item from the Croydon Framework. Full in-house provision would result in cost savings of some £40,000 per annum or 16% of the cost at current prices, assuming performance levels and deliverable days are maintained. Although there are no performance issues with the current in house team, the risks of non-delivery increasingly fall on the council as the in-house capacity is increased.
- 3.21 The risks associated with in-house provision are principally non-delivery of the audit plan. If the contractor fails to deliver, they do not get paid and non-delivery could in theory be recovered via temporary internal resource. With an in-house service, sickness, performance or project overrun issues are all risks which are borne by the council and any savings can be quickly eroded. This option has, therefore, been rejected. The other significant issues are flexibility and specialism. Under the current arrangements the council can adjust audit days relatively easily, or pursue shared service arrangements if appropriate. With its own directly employed staff this flexibility is harder to maintain. In addition, private sector providers in this field can usually offer staff more attractive career structures, and in turn can provide purchasers with ready access to specialist skills.
- 3.22 This option has, therefore, been rejected.

#### **Option 3 – Tender for replacement for current outsourced element of service**

- 3.23 Given the short time frame until expiry of the current contract, it is considered unlikely that there would be sufficient time to enter negotiations with other authorities and agree specification and evaluation criteria to enter into any joint procurement arrangements. In addition, eleven other London councils are already in the Croydon framework and at least two, up to a possible seven, are about to procure another framework contract. Therefore, the council will need to conduct a full re-tendering exercise as a sole party either for a similar level of provision to the current contract or for a fully outsourced service as mentioned above.
- 3.24 The advantages of a re-tender are possible cost savings, a change in internal audit approach, new providers possibly in the market by 2015 with some of the second tier firms attempting to obtain business. Disadvantages include the cost and time



associated with tendering and potential disruption and loss of accumulated on-site experience within the existing contractor should they be unsuccessful.

#### **Option 4 - Join another existing framework**

- 3.25 Officers understand that the London borough of Camden and Islington has indicated that they are about to award a framework contract for four years from 1<sup>st</sup> June 2014 on behalf of seven councils. Others will be free to procure from the framework. The results of this exercise will be known shortly. Brent, on publication of this framework, could therefore consider whether this would be a more advantageous route.
- 3.26 Other shared service options may be pursued. The London boroughs of Havering and Newham have recently established a Joint Committee with a staffing structure under it – entitled OneSource – which exists to provide back office support services to local authorities. Their offer includes internal audit and so this may be a potential way forward, as might other shared service arrangements.

#### **Other factors**

- 3.27 The audit market is somewhat competitive, with firms such as Grant Thorntons, Mazars and BDO recently showing interest in winning more local authority work. The only firm excluded from tendering are the council's current external audit provider, KPMG.
- 3.28 This market has become much more fast moving in the last year and the options of sharing services have yet to be fully explored. However, the council will always need some internal audit provision, and this report has shown that tendering for this is the route considered most likely to secure better value. This will not preclude joining other frameworks that may become available, or pursuing other shared service options. At this time Members are therefore recommended to approve the pre-tender considerations below so that a procurement can be commenced, which will not preclude other options being explored.
- 3.29 In accordance with Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89, pre-tender considerations have been set out below for the approval of the Cabinet.

<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Response</b>	
(i)	The nature of the service.	Internal Audit Services	
(ii)	The estimated value.	£ 1,000,000	
(iii)	The contract term.	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2015 to 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2019	
(iv)	The tender procedure to be adopted.	Open Procedure	
v)	The procurement timetable.	<b>Indicative dates are:</b>	
		Adverts placed	12/09/14

Ref.	Requirement	Response	
		Deadline for tender submissions	24/10/14
		Panel evaluation and shortlist for interview	14/11/14
		Interviews and contract decision	21/11/14
		Report recommending Contract award circulated internally for comment	01/12/14
		Cabinet approval	14/01/15 (Indicative)
		Minimum 10 calendar day standstill period – notification issued to all tenderers and additional debriefing of unsuccessful tenderers (as the contract is covered by the full EU Regulations)	27/01/15
		Contract Mobilisation	28/01/15
		Contract start date	01/04/15
(vi)	The evaluation criteria and process.	<p>1. At selection (qualification stage) shortlists are to be drawn up in accordance with the Council's Contract Procurement and Management Guidelines namely the qualification questionnaire and thereby meeting the Council's financial standing requirements, technical capacity and technical expertise.</p> <p>2. At tender evaluation stage, the panel will evaluate the tenders against the following criteria: Price 60%, Quality 40%, with Quality criteria consisting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic and Operational Approach</li> <li>• Systems and working methods</li> <li>• Indicative resources, staff mix and management</li> <li>• Innovative solutions</li> <li>• Benchmarking</li> </ul>	

Ref.	Requirement	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborative approach</li> </ul>
(vii)	Any business risks associated with entering the contract.	No Specific business risks are considered to be associated with entering into the proposed contract.
(viii)	The Council's Best Value duties.	This procurement process and on-going contractual requirement will ensure that the Council's Best Value obligations are met.
(ix)	Consideration of Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012	See Section 8 below
(x)	Any staffing implications, including TUPE and pensions.	See section 7 below
(xi)	The relevant financial, legal and other considerations.	See sections 4 and 5 below.

3.30 The Cabinet is asked to give its approval to these proposals as set out in the recommendations and in accordance with Standing Order 89.

#### **4. Financial Implications**

- 4.1 The current service (Option 1) costs the council approximately £300,000 per annum for 900 days of contracted work. The exact cost of a new outsourced element of the service would be dependent upon the changes to the number of contracted days and the secured cost per day that is agreed.
- 4.2 Section 3 of this report explains the potential costs and benefits to the council of each of the options to be considered. As set out in paragraph 3.28 officers will continue to explore developing opportunities to identify a solution that provides best value.
- 4.3 Owing to market uncertainty and likely changes to the number of days contracted the potential savings of the various options will be quantified as part of the tendering exercise
- 4.4 Any decision altering the in-house audit provision would likely have financial implications for the council in terms of redundancy costs. These will be quantified as part of the tendering exercise.
- 4.5 The cost of this contract would be funded from the existing Audit & Investigation budget allocation.

## **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.1 The estimated value of an outsourced contract over its lifetime is in excess of the current EU threshold for services and the nature of these services means they fall within Part A of Schedule 3 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (“the EU Regulations”). The tendering of the services is therefore governed in full by the EU Regulations. As the estimated value of the contract over its lifetime is in excess of £250k, the procurement and award of the contract is subject to the council’s own Standing Orders in respect of High Value.
- 5.2 For High Value Contracts, the Cabinet must approve the pre-tender considerations set out in paragraph 3.29 above (Standing Order 89) and the inviting of tenders (Standing Order 88).
- 5.3 Once the tendering process is undertaken Officers will report back to the Cabinet in accordance with Contract Standing Orders, explaining the process undertaken in tendering the contract and recommending award.
- 5.4 As this procurement is subject to the full application of the EU Regulations, the council must observe the requirements of the mandatory minimum 10 calendar standstill period imposed by the EU Regulations before the contract can be awarded. The requirements include notifying all tenderers in writing of the council’s decision to award and providing additional debrief information to unsuccessful tenderers on receipt of a written request. The standstill period provides unsuccessful tenderers with an opportunity to challenge the council’s award decision if such a challenge is justifiable. However if no challenge or successful challenge is brought during the period, at the end of the standstill period the council can issue a letter of acceptance to the successful tenderer and the contract may commence.
- 5.5 As indicated in Section 7, the intention is to retain the in-house provision and therefore council staff will not transfer pursuant to the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (“TUPE”). There may however be a transfer of staff currently employed by Mazars to any new provider pursuant to TUPE.

## **6. Diversity Implications**

- 6.1 The proposals in this report have been subject to screening and officers believe that there are no diversity implications.

## **7. Staffing Implications**

- 7.1 Internal audit services are currently provided by a combination of Mazars’ staff and staff employed by the council. As it is intended to retain the in-house provision, there will be no staffing implications for council staff.

## **8. Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012**

- 8.1 Since 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013, the council, in common with all public authorities subject to the EU Regulations, has been under duty pursuant to the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 to consider how the services being procured might improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of its area; how, in conducting the procurement process, the council might act with a view to securing that improvement; and whether the council should undertake consultation. This duty applies to the procurement of the proposed contract as Services over the threshold for application

of the EU Regulations are subject to the requirements of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012.

- 8.2 Given the nature of the services being delivered under the contract and the limited market for the delivery of these services, Officers have concluded that it is not appropriate to undertake any consultation and that the only measures appropriate to meeting the requirements of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 are to operate the Council's usual procurement processes.

## **9. Background Papers**

1. Report from the Deputy Director of Finance to the Executive 11<sup>th</sup> February 2013 – Internal Audit Contract 2013-2015

### **Contact Officer**

Simon Lane  
Head of Audit and Investigation  
020 8937 1260

**CONRAD HALL**  
**Chief Finance Officer**

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank