



**Executive**  
16 September 2013

**Report from the Director of  
Adult Social Services**

Wards Affected: ALL

**Funding to develop community-based meals on wheels**

**1.0 Summary**

- 1.1 This report describes a proposal to cease the provision of a Council meals-on-wheels service, and progress made to date on developing and facilitating transition to service users being sign-posted to community organisations able to provide such services. This report also sets out the current meals on wheels budget, and provides an illustration on the projected savings from this service restructure over the next 2 financial years.
- 1.2 The report seeks approval to proceed with the transition to this model of meeting service users' needs.

**2.0 Recommendations**

**That the Executive:**

- 2.1 Note the progress made to date in developing a market within the community, for the provision of meals to vulnerable individuals through developing a network of providers who will contract directly with the individual to provide meals.
- 2.2 Note the progress made to date in informing service users of the proposed change and beginning to shift service users into services with community-based providers.
- 2.3 Approve the cessation of a Council meals on wheels service.
- 2.4 Approve the development of a community directory of local providers for service users to choose from, whilst allowing scope for service users to make their own choices and spend their money (including, possibly direct payments to assist with the cost of delivery) on alternative meal options.

- 2.5 Approve the process of reviewing the care needs of all those who currently receive a meals on wheels services so that effective care plans can be set up to ensure that, notwithstanding the termination of the contract with Apetito, we continue to fulfil our statutory duty. This may include facilitating individuals, unable to access community resources independently, to receive a meal in their home via a direct payment of £3.50 towards the 'transactional costs' of food delivery and preparation. (As is required currently any individual will be required to make a £3.50 client contribution towards each meal).
- 2.6 To note proposals for Adult Social Services to procure an emergencies and major incidents meals service to provide hot meals to rest centres where there is a need for these to be provided following a major disaster or other emergency situation, pending the termination of the Apetito contract.
- 2.7 To note the meals on wheels budget and savings projections.

### **3.0 Background**

- 3.1 Currently Meals on Wheels (MoW) is a hot/frozen food delivery service for vulnerable people who meet FACS criteria 'Substantial' and 'Critical' and do not have capacity to prepare or purchase a meal for themselves. The council has a statutory responsibility within section 2 of the 1970 Chronically Sick and Disabled Person's Act to make arrangements for the provision of meals, whether at home or elsewhere, to chronically sick or disabled people.
- 3.2 The statutory obligations laid out in the 1970 Act do not require the local authority to run an actual MoW's service, only to ensure that where a person does have an assessed need for regular meals to be provided, the Council has some way of ensuring that this occurs.
- 3.3 The Apetito contract expires on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013. The council has the option of approaching Apetito to extend the contract for no more than two additional years (up to 29<sup>th</sup> November 2015) but unless this is exercised the contract will expire on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013.
- 3.4 In March 2012, an options appraisal was presented to Adult Social Services DMT where it was agreed that the development of a community-based MoW service involving service users choosing their preferred meals provider via direct payments would be explored following a thorough needs analysis of the current service users receiving MoW.
- 3.5 In August/September 2012 reviews were undertaken of 20 service users in the Harlesden area. From this, it was determined that, whilst it might be possible to reduce the number of individuals currently receiving MoW delivery service because some individuals can access resources in the community independently, it would still be necessary for the Council to ensure the provision of a hot/frozen food delivery service to people's homes to ensure

some service users receive a meal and meet their nutritional needs, because a proportion of service users do not have capacity to purchase food themselves or leave their home unaided.

- 3.6 The reviews undertaken also found that services users might not necessarily have capacity to accept and manage direct payments to purchase that support directly. However, as the figures below demonstrate, this remains the most effective and cost efficient means to meet this need, therefore to enable service users to receive a direct payment, integrated commissioning would need to commission a support planning service to enable service users to make payments and to provide advocacy on behalf of these service users to providers (see below).
- 3.7 It was subsequently agreed at DMT in January 2013 that a pilot would be run with Harlesden Methodist Church, in order to:
- Test the capacity of a community-based organisation to deliver a door-to-door meals to clients with high-end needs
  - Test the efficacy of direct payments as a means of managing the cost to the community groups/service users of delivering meals to individual's homes, and of the capacity of two providers (Age UK and Elders Voice) to enable service users without capacity to receive direct payments by managing these on the service user's behalf.
  - It was also agreed that a scoping exercise be undertaken around the wider market for community-based meals services, to ascertain whether there is capacity to roll out a community-based model by 29th November 2013.

### **Harlesden Methodist Church Pilot**

- 3.9 From March 2013 a meals pilot service has been set up with Harlesden Methodist Church, whereby the church have prepared and delivered hot food to service users with an assessed need for meals on wheels in Harlesden.
- 3.10 This pilot has involved the following:
- Developing a functioning meals service within Harlesden Methodist Church
  - Cancelling the Apetito service for 10 service users in the Harlesden area, and setting them up with a direct payment mechanism (pre-paid card) to pay for the church's meals service
  - Referring individuals with a lack of capacity to manage their own funds to Age UK or Elders Voice to manage their direct payment on their behalf in the form of a pre-paid card, and for these organisations to provide a form of advocacy/check with the church around the quality of the service
  - Evaluating the quality of the service and collecting feedback from service users

- 3.11 All service users received a direct payment in the form of a pre-paid card and were assisted / required to set-up standing orders onto these pre-paid cards with client contributions of £3.50 per meal. The council added £3.50 per meal onto the pre-paid cards to subsidise the transactional costs of the meal (e.g. delivery costs) to ensure that the council's responsibility to make arrangements for the delivery of meals was met by fully compensating providers for the costs of delivering and preparing meals.
- 3.12 A key intention for the service was for it to be as self-sustaining as possible. On-going support was provided, as was £15,000 by way of start-up payments (for kitchen equipment and ramp-up costs); however, the church was engaged as a partner with the council rather than a contracted provider. A memorandum of understanding was drawn up in consultation with Legal and Procurement and signed by both parties prior to the commencement of the pilot; mapping out expectations around when meals should be delivered, procedures that the provider would be expected to comply with if they received no-reply from a service user and other safeguarding procedures or other requirements of service (e.g. health and safety, registration of premises and food hygiene).
- 3.13 Harlesden Methodist Church was required to coordinate DBS checks for all volunteers and staff engaged with service users as part of the pilot. The Church was also required to attend courses run by Learning and Development on the department's safeguarding and no-replies procedures and on dementia awareness. Prior to the commencement of the service, the council also undertook checks of the provider to ensure that:
- They had capacity to meet the dietary requirements of all service users
  - They had capacity in relation to staffing levels and delivery capacity to cover the service 7 days a week
  - They had contingency plans in place to cover the service in the event of service disruption (e.g. staffing illness/kitchen un-operational etc.)
  - They were registered with environmental health/food standards and conducted the required health and safety and food hygiene checks
- 3.14 The pilot was evaluated through a mix of regular meetings with the Church, reviews of the Church's data records, the completion of reviews by care assessors in the review team, and the collection of service user feedback via telephone interviews.
- 3.15 The church has subsequently delivered over the pilot to date in that they have:
- Not missed a delivery
  - Developed the capacity to deliver meals on Sunday from May 2013 (2 months into pilot), subsequently evidencing a capacity to deliver a full 7-days a week service
  - Followed the no-replies procedure and conducted the requisite checks to ascertain service users whereabouts

- Consistently delivered meals within the defined timeframe of 12.30pm-2pm

3.15 Of the 10 people identified to be referred to the pilot, 8 had direct payments set up either to self-manage or to be managed by Age UK or Elders Voice via a companion card. Both of the service users who were not referred were because they were admitted to hospital prior to the pilot start date. As such, 100% of the service users referred to the service had a DP set up. Of these 6 received a companion card to be managed by Age UK and Elders Voice.

3.17 In relation to service user outcomes, the feedback received throughout has been largely positive. Of the 8 service users reviewed 2 months after starting on the pilot service by the Support Planning and Review Team:

- 6 stated they were happy or 'extremely happy' with the quality of meals provided and the quality of service
- 1 opted to leave the service and has set-up a private arrangement with her carer
- 1 stated that the lack of a fresh meal delivery on a Sunday meant that they were opting to set-up a private arrangement on Sunday, but were happy with the rest of the weeks service

<b>Mr. A</b>	Mr A was joined by his niece. He stated that he is happy with the current arrangements, and is pleased with the standards of foods delivered. There has been the occasional late arrival of food, however he stated that staff are friendly at all times. He stated that he is unable to have any spicy food or hot foods. His niece stated that there continues to be some confusion around paying for the service, as his niece indicated that there is a considerable amount of money still in DP accounts.
<b>Mr. H</b>	Mr H remains extremely happy with the current arrangements for his meals. He is able to manage the packing and states that the food is always hot and a big improvements from previous providers. He prefers his food in one container. Suggestion made of possible yogurt or fruit as a pudding; he also asked if soup can be included on the menu. Outstanding issue remain with the complexion of the standing order forms. This issue is now being dealt with by his niece who was recently given information from post office website.
<b>Mrs. H</b>	Mrs H is happy with the current arrangements in place via Harlesden Methodist Church.
<b>Mrs. L</b>	Mrs L was unhappy with the limited choice of foods on the menu from pilot scheme, and therefore decided to terminate the service on 9 <sup>th</sup> April for a private arrangement. Carer's assistance with heating up her meals.
<b>Mrs. V</b>	Mrs V stated that she was unhappy with the curry meals provided and has now opted for English type meals i.e. cottage pie, fish and chips and spaghetti Bolognese. She is happy to continue to receive meals 3 times a week. Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays.
<b>Mrs. SH</b>	Mrs SH started off by stating that she was pleased with the meals in the beginning, however she feels that the standards have dropped slightly. She stated that at times the food presentation is poor, and in unhappy that it comes in one container, describing as baby food appearance. She is pleased with the taste of the food, and remains happy that there is further room for improvements.
<b>Mr. V</b>	Home visit to Mr V to review meals on wheels as well as services in place. who is his NOK. Mr V is happy with current arrangements in place with his meals on wheels providers.
<b>Mr. T</b>	Home visit to Mr T to discuss MOW pilot. Mr T stated that at times the food is very

<p>bland and tasteless. He would prefer more seasonings. He remains happy with the amount provided and the choices in the menu, however he was unable to tell me what he was having the next day even though food was chosen advance. Occasionally the food has arrived luke warm, but he is happy with the times the food arrives. Finally he stated that he would have liked a pudding with his meal as was the case with Apetito.</p>
--

## Market Scoping

- 3.18 Parallel to the Harlesden Methodist Church pilot, a market scoping programme has been run to:
- Engage community groups and organisations, restaurants and public/private organisations who could potentially provide a community-based meals service
  - Ascertain the demand for home delivered meals in the borough, and the geographical location of this demand, in order to map a geographical directory of providers linked to service users, to evidence the capacity of the market to meet the needs of those currently receiving a service
  - Begin to scope out project plans for community organisations, to potentially begin referrals to these organisations from August.
- 3.19 The approach to engaging the market has involved:
- Posting 2 adverts in the Brent and Kilburn Times and the Wembley Observer
  - Advertising on the Brent website
  - Drawing up a directory of community organisations and restaurants in Brent and forwarding the advert on to them.
  - Forwarding the advert to schools and day centres in Brent
  - Planning to attend the multi-faith forum on 8 July to explain the project and obtain expressions of interest.
  - Setting up a provider forum for 3 July for all interested organisations
- 3.20 Following this, we have engaged and began developmental work with the following providers:
- Cricklewood Homeless Concern
  - Harlesden Methodist Church
  - Early Bird Catering
  - Sudbury Neighbourhood Centre
  - Catalyst Housing – Unity Centre
  - Hermolis Catering
  - Jalaram Foods
- 3.21 Alongside this, using data from the performance team, we have also been able to map demand and get an indication of interested parties' capacity to deliver a service to the diverse range of needs and preferences of Brent service users. This data analysis shows that there are 187 service users

receiving MoW at present. These are divided across the borough in the following way:

South (Kilburn; Queens Park; Kensal Green; Brondesbury)	27
Central East (Dollis Hill; Mapesbury; Dudden Hill)	16
Central West (Stonebridge; Harlesden; Willesden; Cricklewood)	49
North East (Alperton; Wembley; Preston; Tokyngton; Sudbury; Northwick Park)	59
North West (Barnhill; Fryent; Queensbury; Kenton; Kingsbury)	36

3.22 The data analysis also shows that the majority of meals provided are Western European (58%), with the others in descending order of quantity; African-Caribbean (19%); Kosher (9%); Asian Vegetarian (7%); Asian meat (4%); Soft/Pureed (3%).

3.23 After receiving initial expressions of interest, Integrated Commissioning have worked with the providers to enable them to provide the service and check that they meet certain service requirements. This has involved:

- Developing sustainable and realistic service delivery plans with all providers (involving developing a cash flow and asking providers to produce delivery plans for discussion)
- Conducting initial checks on food standard, health and safety and hygiene and ensuring providers are registered with environmental health
- Ensuring all providers have sufficient levels of staffing and that these staff are DBS checked
- Providing training on 'No-replies', 'Safeguarding' and 'Working with Vulnerable Adults' to all providers

3.24 The outcome of the market scoping and development subsequently means that there is capacity to cover the whole borough, with some providers working in zones and some across the borough:

- Cricklewood Homeless Concern – can cover the whole of Brent, and provide Western European/Caribbean/Indian meals
- Early Bird Catering – can cover the Wembley/Sudbury/Kingsbury/Tokyngton area and provide Western European/Caribbean meals
- Harlesden Methodist Church – can cover Harlesden, Stonebridge and Kensal Rise and provide Western European/Caribbean/Indian meals
- Catalyst Catering – can cover Harlesden, Stonebridge and Willesden and provide Western European/Caribbean meals
- Sudbury Neighbourhood Centre – can provide for day centres only and provide Western European/Caribbean meals
- Jalaram Foods – who can cover the whole borough and provide Asian Vegetarian meals

- Hermolis – who can cover the whole borough and provide Kosher meals

3.25 The current level of interest in the market provides a sufficient basis to cover most of the borough. Currently, a bespoke Halal meals service is a gap to be filled via on-going market engagement. Cricklewood Homeless Concern have stated that they could provide this if required.

### Day Centres

3.26 In addition to providing hot and frozen meals to service users homes, Apetito also provide meals to day centres in Brent. For these meals, the council currently subsidises the cost of each meal by £3.50, and service users also contribute £3.50 per meal. The breakdowns for these are below:

Kingsbury Resource Centre	384
John Billam	430
Elders Voice	118
Hibiscus Club	24
Aspects Unit	38
Asian Disability Alliance	5
Wise Project	250
Rendezvous Club	96

3.27 The community directory represents a vehicle to promote alternatives to Apetito for day centres. In regards to John Billam, the day centre has agreed that they will provide its meals independently from the Apetito service, and the council will subsequently look to procure a provider to set up a kitchen/café service in the John Billam Centre. Kingsbury Resource Centre will need to receive a service from a community provider, and this will also have procurement implications owing to the volume of meals being provided because it is a council run centre. The remaining day centres are run by independent providers, and these have been engaged with by the council and will look to liaise individually (with support from the council) with providers to make a choice over their preferred meal provider.

### Assessment of Care Needs

3.28 To date, 15 MoW service users in the Harlesden area have received individual face-to-face assessments of their care needs to draw up effective care plans to meet their nutritional needs. Of these 15 service users, 12 were enabled to receive a direct payment in the form of a pre-paid card, and set-up £3.50 client contributions onto these cards via a standing order. The council then put £3.50 onto the pre-paid cards per meal to cover the 'transactional costs' of meals. These service users then used the pre-paid cards to purchase a hot food delivery service from Harlesden Methodist Church. Of the 15 service users assessed, 3 have opted to meet their nutritional needs independently by

either purchasing care to shop and cook for them, or getting meals via a private arrangement (e.g. a family member).

- 3.29 All of these 15 service users initially received a letter before they were visited by a care assessor for a face-to-face review, which stated that the council was changing the way service users would receive meals on wheels, and that service users would be assessed and enabled to receive a direct payment to purchase a service from a community based provider.
- 3.30 The commissioning team will be sending out letters to all service users receiving meals on wheels in the week of the 19<sup>th</sup> August informing them of the proposed change and that they will receive an individual assessment and enabled to receive a direct payment. The letter will inform service users that they will be required to make a £3.50 client contribution per meal onto their pre-paid card and they can use this card to purchase a service from a community provider, or make their own arrangements to meet their nutritional needs. Adult Social Services then intends to review the care needs of every service user receiving meals on wheel between September and November, and setting up direct payments in the form of pre-paid cards for them to purchase meals where they are assessed as unable to meet their own nutritional needs.

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

- 4.1 Compared with the Apetito service, the community-based meals model has the potential to yield significant savings for the council. This is because although there are additional associated costs to the community meals service (e.g. market development costs; commissioning costs of the managed budget providers; contingency planning and emergency provision costs for rest centres), the cost model for the community meals service door-to-door delivery service is based on a fixed £3.50 charge to the council per unit; whereas the Apetito charge rate to the council is £8.52. Similarly the costs to the council to provide meals to day centres is reduced with the community meals service. The cost per meal to the council for day centre meals is £3.50 with Apetito, this will be £2 per meal with community meals because the transactional costs associated with delivering these meals is less than for door-to-door deliveries to multiple households, and Integrated Commissioning have subsequently negotiated a lower rate with community providers.
- 4.2 Of note, the client's contribution for the community meals (both door-to-door delivery and day centres) will be £3.50 per meal. This is the same as the current charge rate of £3.50 per meal, although this constitutes a contribution onto a pre-paid card for door-to-door delivery, rather than a charge, which should further minimise any risk to the Council against non-payment by the service user.
- 4.3 The following illustrates how these savings were estimated. The first section looks at the commissioning costs of the Apetito service on a unit and annual

basis and the proposed costs of the community meals service in terms of meal costs; market development costs, contingency funding and associated running costs, with explanations behind these assumptions. The 2<sup>nd</sup> section then looks at the comparative costs of the community-based model and Apetito from December 2013 to April 2014 (the remainder of the financial year from the point to which the Apetito contract lapses), and then for next financial year (2014/15).

- 4.4 It should be noted that the contingency costs earmarked in this paper reflect the worse-case scenario to ensure service continuity. The table below details the steps that would be taken before the £62,000 approach would be taken. During the market engagement and community-development phase of this project, work has been undertaken with providers to develop internal provider contingency plans to ensure service continuity.

### Service Costs

Apetito:

Meal cost to the council	£8.52
Annual Cost (Budgeted cost of Apetito hot/frozen meal service for 2012/13 PLUS Actuals for day centres)	£613,000

Community Meals:

Meal cost to the council	£3.50 (for door-to-door provision); £2 (for day centre provision)	
Annual Meal Cost (176 service users, average of 6 meals per week – NOTE – 6 meals the average number from Apetito actuals)	£224,000	
Associated costs	Cost area and assumptions	Cost
	Estimated cost of Market Development: Cap of £15,000 for start up costs for an estimated 8 providers	£120,000
	Estimated cost of managed Budget annual support by Age UK/Elders Voice: based on rate of 15% of weekly direct payment element value for 163 service users (based on the proportion of those receiving DP's with Harlesden Methodist Church who required a managed budget)	£22,000 p.a

	<p>Contingency costs: In the event of a provider in a local area being unable to continue their service, the council will set aside £62,000 for contingency funding. This covers the logistical cost of food preparation for 40 service users (an estimated number for a single regional provider) and the cost of 30 minutes care for service users to deliver food for 6 months, after which at the latest a permanent solution will have been identified</p> <p>Of note, prior to this contingency measure being put into practice, the following measures would be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For providers to put in place their temporary contingency measure (memorandum of understanding will stipulate that providers should have a 1 week contingency), and for the effected service users to be supported to identify another provider</li> <li>- For other local providers to be asked whether they have delivery capacity to provide a service for these service users.</li> </ul>	£62,000
	<p>Emergency Planning costs to provide meals to day centres: Within the current Apetito contract, there is a clause which states that Apetito will provide meals to rest centres 365 days a year when required as a result of an emergency/disaster. This is a statutory requirement, so Integrated Commissioning will contract a provider to provide this service following the termination of the Apetito contract. The costs are based on a retainer of £10 per day, 365 days a year, which is set at that level owing to low historical demands for service usage. The council would have to incur costs in addition to this if more than 500 meals were to be provided over the course of a year.</p>	£4,000

**Comparative costs to the council, December 2013-April 2014 and April 2014-April 2015**

4.6 The data below shows that the community meals service represents a potential saving of £30,000 against the Apetito contract if extended until the end of this financial year, largely owing to the start-up costs associated with

market development. As stated the service may run over-budget for this financial year owing to the costs of withdrawal from the Apetito contract. From 2014/15 onwards however, the community meals service has the potential to yield £300,000 worth of savings each year.

#### December 2013 to April 2014

Apetito	<b>£281,000</b> (=£613,000 x 0.42)
Community Meals	<b>£251,000</b> (=5 months of 6 meals per week for 176 people; plus cost of provision to day centres; plus £120,000 start up cost; plus 5 month costs for Age UK/Elders Voice; plus 5/12 of the annual contingency planning cost and the emergency continuity costs)
Saving	<b>£30,000</b>

#### April 2014 to April 2015

Apetito	<b>£613,000</b>
Community Meals	<b>£313,000</b> (=12 months of 6 meals per week for 176 people; plus day centre costs; plus annual cost for Age UK/Elders Voice; plus annual contingency cost and annual emergency continuity costs)
Saving	<b>£300,000</b>

## **5 Legal Implications**

- 5.1 Section 2(g) Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 requires a local authority to provide meals for a person, either in their home or elsewhere, who is assessed as requiring services by way of s29 National Assistance Act 1948. Presently the Local Authority fulfils this function by completing needs assessment, in line with their duties under s47 NHSCC Act 1990, and where a need for meals to be delivered to a person's home is identified, securing that service via the contract with Apetito.
- 5.2 There is no requirement under the CSDPA 1970 that the Local Authority manage a meals on wheels service or contract for such a provision. However, where an individual has an assessed need for the provision of meals in their home or elsewhere that need must be met and cannot be withdrawn unless a reassessment of their needs demonstrates that this is no longer a need or that it could be met by alternative provision. It should be noted that it is proposed to review all those currently in receipt of meals on wheels services before the current contract with Apetito is due to expire to ensure that, if the person has an assessed eligible need for the provision of meals either in their own home

or a day centre, that the community based provision will adequately meet this need from December 2013.

- 5.3 Under the Health and Social Care Act 2001 (and 2008) it is permissible for the Local Authority to arrange for individuals to receive a direct payment rather than directly commissioned services. Again it is noted that the Local Authority propose that, where an individual lacks capacity to consent to direct payments, either Age Concern or Elder's voice will be appointed as their 'suitable person' in line with s146 HSCA 2008, to manage this payment on their behalf.
- 5.4 It is also noted that the Local Authority does not propose to have a binding contract with the service providers, as is the case with other organisations who deliver services direct to service users. As a result there are no procurement implications for the Council. There will however be a need for each service user to have a simple contract with their provider, and it is proposed to use this to ensure that those organisations comply with the relevant legal obligations regarding health and safety, food preparation and the vetting of those working with vulnerable groups and individuals. That service user contract will also set out expectations for the providers to consider the Pan London Safeguarding Procedures and Policies and adhere to operational guidance regarding "no replies" etc. This should ensure that the Local Authority is alerted to any safeguarding concerns or welfare issues for the individuals. Although this contract will be between the service user and provider it is proposed that the Council have the right as a third party to enforce the contract on service users' behalf, in accordance with the Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999.
- 5.5 In conclusion the commissioning team has set up arrangements, described above, to ensure that any needs identified within a s47 NHSCCA needs assessment are appropriately met.
- 5.6 Under paragraph 3.1(m) of the Constitution, it is not possible for Chief Officers to take decisions about a permanent and significant reduction in level of service. Such matters are reserved for Executive decision. Although in this case the Council will be securing the delivery of service in a different way, so delivering on its statutory obligations, legal advice has been given that the ending of a Council meals service does fall within this paragraph, hence this report to the Executive.

## **6. Diversity Implications**

- 6.1 The Equality Act 2010 section 149 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. Under the legislation there are eight protected

characteristics including age, gender, disability and race. This policy will primarily impact on those with the protected characteristics of age and disability. A full Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken and information resulting from the consultation undertaken in 2011 has been used in this analysis.

- 6.2 The proposal is likely to impact on older and disabled residents (two characteristics now protected under the Equality Act). A full Equality Impact Assessment is attached to this report as Appendix C and Members are respectfully asked to consider this document and its conclusions so that they are in a position to pay due regard to their duty under s149 Equality Act 2010 when reaching a decision on this policy.

## **7. Staffing/Accommodation Implications**

TUPE is unlikely to apply at the end of the contract with Apetito to transfer their staff to the new providers. Apetito may therefore have to make their staff currently engaged in the Brent service redundant. However there is no requirement on the Council to reimburse those redundancy costs.

### **Background Papers (TBA)**

APPENDIX A - PROJECT PLAN  
APPENDIX B – RISK LOG  
APPENDIX C – EIA

### **Contact Officers**

Steven Forbes  
Head of Integrated Commissioning, Adult Social Services

Samuel Jacobson  
National Management Trainee, Adult Social Services

PHIL PORTER  
Acting Director, Adult Social Services

APPENDIX A - PROJECT PLAN  
 APPENDIX B – RISK LOG  
 APPENDIX C – EIA FROM PILOT

Appendix A - Project Plan

Workstream	Work Area	Timescale/Deadline	Responsible Officer
Harlesden Methodist Church	Evaluate and work-through future operating model	June	SJ
	Ramp up to 30	September	SJ/Review
Direct Payments	Commission Elders Voice/Age UK	July	SJ/SF
	Brief Review and get resource for ramp-up	July	SJ/Review
	Shift service users onto direct payments	September	Review/MNS/SJ
Market Engagement	Market Forum	July	SJ/SF/SS/MNS
	Develop memorandum of understanding with providers	August	SJ/MNS/Legal
Market Development	Work with providers in parallel with review to ramp-up numbers (start with 1 month trials)	August-November	SJ/MNS
Governance	DMT	July	SJ
	ASC Programme Board	August-November	SJ
	Exec	August-September	SJ/SF
	DMT Update	October	SJ
Apetito	Formal decision re. contract	September	SF/JK
	Wind-down engagement	September-November	SF/JK

Appendix B – Risk Log

Risk	Potential Impact	Probability	Mitigation	Risk Owner
Service users are unable to purchase services themselves/use DP's	High	Low	Use of Age UK/Elders Voice to manage payments on S.U behalf	SJ/SF
Service users are unwilling to purchase service themselves	Low	Medium	Review Team instructed to 'sell' service; wide a market as possible developed	SJ/Review/Finance
Lack of capacity in market to manage demands of service	High	Medium	Extensive engagement work; scope out market and work with it on an on-going basis	ICU
Lack of capacity means contract with Apetito must be extended - increasing unit costs	High	Low	Extensive engagement work; scope out market and work with it; engage review team at early juncture to identify resource to shift service users onto DP's	ICU/Review Team
Apetito have a destabilising impact on pilot (i.e. through conversations with service users/withdrawal of service) where they fear loss of commerce	Medium	Low	Engage Apetito from early point.	Jas Kothiria/SF
Lack of market capacity leads to service users going without meals	High	Medium	Extensive engagement work and monitoring of providers for first few months; Age UK/EV/ICU to monitor on on-going basis; contingency fund to ensure if a provider is unable to provide the service then service users are	ICU

			covered for a period of 6 months until an additional provider is found	
Risk of challenge under Equality Act 2010 because of unviability of alternatives for vulnerable service users	Low	Low	Ensure Age UK/Elders Voice provide support to those unable to manage DP's; provide range of local options to meet need. An Equalities Impact Assessment will be completed prior to executive	ICU
Service users purchasing food direct from market purchase food of poor nutritional value	Low	Low	Wide market engagement; develop 'nutritional guide' and vet provider list	
Day centres experience discontinuity of meals provision	Medium	Low	Engage with day centres to explain change and signpost to community providers	SF/SJ
Review Team cannot facilitate shifts to direct payments for the 170 service users between Sept and November	High	Medium	Work with Charlie McNally to identify a resource; provide intensive initial support and coaching for review team	CM/SF

Appendix C – Equalities Impact Assessment telephone interviews from meals on wheels pilot with Harlesden Methodist Church

Service User	Date called	How does the quality of the food compare with the previous service?	Does the new food offer meet your dietary needs?	Does the new food offer meet your cultural needs/personal preferences?	Does the new food offer provide more or less choice?	Is the service more or less flexible and responsive than Apetito?	Does the food come in a timely manner as expected?	Is the food presented and delivered in a way that you are able to eat?	Has your health or social care needs changed as a result of the change in service?
Ms L	Unable to reach								
Mr T	08/08/2013	Similar - Tavistock meals have improved - good deserts	Yes	Yes	More	Same	Yes - 12.30pm	Yes	No
Ms H	Unable to reach incorrect number								
Mr. V	07/08/2013	Seems fine	Seems ok	Requested food not to be mashed up - need recognise food	Same	Not sure	Yes	Yes	Not Sure
Mr. A	08/08/2013	Good - likes the meals - had fish & chips today	Yes	Yes	Not sure	Not sure	Yes	Yes	No
Ms. V	07/08/2013	Not as good		No I need	Less choice	Less	Yes	Yes - but	Not eating

				Indian/ Halal/Curry meals				don't like it	the food
Ms SH	01/08/2013	Didn't want to take part in telephone survey							
Mr. H	Unable to reach								
Ms. D	08/08/2013	Didn't like the meals	Wasn't eating them so family now provide meals which carer heats up	No wants "English" only type meals	Didn't provide meals I wanted so have cancelled the service	Less	Yes		
Mr G	07/08/2013	Good - likes the meals - had chicken, cauliflower, potatoes today	Yes	Yes	Same	Same	Yes	Yes	Client has LD
Mr E	07/08/2012	Very bad the main meal has no taste	No	No I want West Indian food	Less choice main meal but like the pudding	Same	Yes	No following stroke I can't open wrapping	
Mr. GR	Unable to reach								