

Summary of budget reduction proposals for Adults Services

		2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2023/24
Ref	Title	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
PA1	Charging for Managed Accounts	120	0	0	0	0	120
PA2	Fast tracking financial assessments	140	0	0	0	0	140
PA3	Capitalisation of CAS	177	0	0	0	0	177
PA4	Housing Related support	600	0	0	0	0	600
PA5	In-House Negotiator	116	344	0	0	0	460
PA6	Transfer of High Cost Day Opps	0	525	15	0	0	540
PA7	Public Health (Sexual Health)	267	0	0	0	0	267
PA8	Investment of drug and alcohol savings in preventative services for adults and families, targeting health inequalities	400	0	0	100	100	600
PA9	Further savings to be delivered by Adults Services	180	180	180	180	0	720
	People (Adults) Totals	2,000	1,049	195	280	100	3,624

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA1

Title of Option:	Charging for Managed Accounts		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	John Everson
Affected Service(s):	Adults	Contact / Lead:	Farzad Fazilat

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Charging Administration Fee

- 1. Appointeeship** - Currently the Council does not charge for administration of Appointeeship clients, unlike Deputyship where there is an administration fee for managing client funds and assets. The full set of Deputyship charges are set out by the Court of Protection. There is no national policy governing charges for Appointeeship. Policy and charges are therefore subject to local Council decisions. Subject to review and potentially Cabinet approval, the Council may decide to charge an administration fee comparable to that levied for Deputyship, the additional income based on 200 new clients could equate to approximately £70k in additional annual income.

- 2. Self-funders** - A number of residents meet the full costs of their care and therefore arrange their own packages of care, without recourse to the local authority. However, some residents who meet the full costs of their care look to the Council to organise the setting up of their care packages – a function for which the Council does not currently charge. Other authorities do charge for this service. As an income-generating opportunity, the Council is proposing to charge for arranging packages of care for self-funders. Given only a minority of disabled and older residents in need of packages of care are self-funders, the income generating potential is limited and a maximum of £50k additional income has been calculated.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Savings	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>					
New net additional savings (year on year)	120				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>1. Appointeeship – Those clients for whom the Council acts as Appointee would be impacted by this change as they would incur a management fee. This is in line with other administrative tasks carried out by the Council on behalf of users and would mirror the approach for Court of Protection clients, ensuring that the Council covers its administrative costs. Administrative costs would only be levied where there were sufficient funds in place to warrant this. Close communication with clients and families will be needed to ensure introduction of charges does not have an adverse impact on vulnerable clients.</p> <p>2. Self-funders - There will be a financial impact on those adults who fund their own care and who choose to have their care managed by the council. Currently this management service is free. Those who do not want to pay this fee would have the choice to manage their own care provision which may result in taking up poor quality services or placing stress on the individual.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>The Council is currently able to charge for Court of Protection clients based on legislative guidance. There is no such guidance for charging fees in relation to appointeeship although their situations are in effect similar.</p> <p>There would be additional administrative time required to manage the charging of this service.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>The Council is already meeting its statutory responsibility to appointeeship clients. As the number of clients increase, however, the council recognises the administrative costs of managing client accounts is increasing and that there is a need to off-set this increasing cost.</p> <p>The statutory requirement to provide care and support under the Care Act 2014 legislation is not affected by the proposal to charge self-funders.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There may be objections from clients and users about the proposal to charge for managing appointeeship accounts. The fact there is no specific statutory guidance around charging appointeeship clients may pose a barrier.			Legal and financial advice prior to implementation and develop breakdown of which clients will be subject to charging.
Self-Funders not managing their care effectively			All people in receipt of Adult Social Care receive a review. Any issues would be identified at this stage or if the service user or carer contacted the service.

Capacity of staff to deliver			A full appraisal will need to be carried out to ensure the application of charging does not incur additional costs.

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA2

Title of Option:	Fast Tracking Financial Assessments		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	John Everson
Affected Service(s):	Adults	Contact / Lead:	Farzad Fazilat

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

This proposal aims to speed up the process of financial assessment so that charging starts as soon after the start of services as possible. The aim would be to carry out any necessary financial assessment before services are brokered and put in place, except in an emergency. The saving lies largely in reducing levels of debt and the costs of recovering overpayments rather than any additional costs to the user of this approach.

The Financial Assessment Process currently starts after a service has been agreed. The delay in assessment results in direct loss of income for the council. The direct loss of income for 2017-18 was £140k. We are changing the process to bring the assessment upstream and complete the calculation and determine client contribution before the service starts to avoid loss of income to the council.

It is worth noting that there are additional non-cashable savings which are deemed to be significant: the avoidance of the costs of lengthy recovery of unpaid contributions and a reduction in queries from providers and families which take up resources within the social care adult services, payments and Brokerage service. The fast tracking of financial assessments will ensure that all assessments are carried out before care packages and funding are agreed and will avoid loss of income as outlined above.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings (year on year)	140				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Service users will be aware of the outcome of the financial assessment sooner and thereby be able to understand any charges they will be required to meet, including deciding to make plans to manage their own care.</p> <p>Users will be aware sooner of the costs of services which have been put in place, with greater clarity about the client's contribution to the cost of care for people who receive care.</p> <p>Users may feel they are being charged more or that charging is playing a part in their assessment – this is not the case.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>There would be an additional requirement for two Financial Assessment Officers to manage the fast tracking of Financial Assessments. The process needs to be fully integrated with the front of the service. This process would need to be fully reviewed prior to implementation to test the capacity of the team to deliver and the cost effectiveness of the approach.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>The statutory requirement to provide care and support under the Care Act 2014 legislation is not affected by this proposal.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Risk that users and carers will disengage with the financial assessment process if carried out near the needs assessment, adding further delay	M	M	Ensure financial assessment is introduced sensitively, demonstrating the benefits to the users of compliance
Capacity of staff to deliver	M	M	<p>Currently the staffing arrangement and process of the referral from Social Care front of the service to the Financial Assessment service does not lend itself to efficient way of working. Financial Assessment Officers need to be working closely with the front of the service to provide Fast Track assessments and provide timely advice to service users.</p> <p>We require two financial Assessment Officers at PO1 grade at the cost of £86k. This is invest to save.</p> <p>This would be reviewed after 24 months.</p>

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA3

Title of Option:	Community Alarms Service		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	John Everson
Affected Service(s):	Adults Social Care	Contact / Lead:	Jeni Plummer

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Haringey's Community Alarms Service provides personal alarms, with a monitoring and response service, and a limited range of other assistive technology to residents. CAS clients include council social care clients, along with self-funders and HfH properties, such as sheltered accommodation. The cost of delivering the service to CAS clients is offset by contributions from clients who would not be eligible for council-funded care.

Because installation of a CAS solution can be considered the provision or adaptation of fixed assets for the benefit of our residents, there is scope within financial regulations to capitalise the majority of the operating and equipment costs of the CAS.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings (year on year)	177				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>N/A</p> <p>Customers would not be impacted by this change to the way the service is funded.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>This results in one post being deleted, however this proposal is already in operation with no negative impacts experienced. All parties involved have been notified.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>Subject to agreement that capitalisation of proposed CAS costs is in line with financial regulations, there are no changes to the Council's ability to meet statutory requirements.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
N/A			

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA4

Title of Option:	Optimising transformational element of the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	Charlotte Pomery
Affected Service(s):	Adults	Contact / Lead:	Gill Taylor

<p>Description of Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>What is the proposal in essence? What is its scope? What will change?</i> - <i>What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)</i> - How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements? - <i>How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?</i> <p><i>[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]</i></p> <p>In essence, ASC is funding housing advice and support which can be funded through the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant whilst we transform these services and create longer term, more sustainable funding routes over the next 3 years.</p>

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
New net additional savings (year on year)	600				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Services to users and carers will be positively affected by this proposal as it is based on a transformational approach which will create more sustainable routes to funding going forward.</p> <p>Users and carers will continue to benefit from a range of housing related support to better meet their needs to live independently in the community.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Positive impact of continuation of housing related support, and a recognition of its continued value.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>The statutory requirement to provide care and support under the Care Act 2014 legislation is not affected by this proposal. The Council's duties under the Homelessness Reduction Act are not affected by these proposals.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There is a risk that routes to sustainable funding for services which can meet need are not identified.	M	M	Focus on transformational activity and doing something different.
Risk of reduced take up of HRS services during any transitional period.	M	M	Continue to make the case for vulnerable residents to be supported in a myriad ways to maintain their tenancies.

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA5

Title of Option:	Care Negotiation activity of Adults Care Packages		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	John Everson
Affected Service(s):	Adults Social Care	Contact / Lead:	Farzad Fazilat

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

An interim care negotiator was recruited in March 18 to work with providers of residential care, semi-independent care and supported living settings across Adult Social Care. The care negotiator used their knowledge of the market and a care fund calculator approach to renegotiate care costs down with providers in relation to overcharging in relation to actual service user needs.

The table below shows that there are potentially savings of £8,858 per week, which could equate to £460,662 annually. It is recommended that 2 care negotiators are recruited on 1 year FTC at P04 with an on cost figure of up to £114k

Financial benefits analysis					
Saving / Cost	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings / costs shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
A. Gross saving	230	230			
B. Revenue implementation cost (One Off Pressure)	-114	0			
C. Ongoing revenue cost	0	0			
D. Net Saving (A+B+C)	116	230	0	0	0
E. Saving(s) already included in MTFs 2018/23					
F. New net additional saving (D minus E)	116	230	0	0	0

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>N/A</p> <p>Customers will not be directly impacted, staff have managed impact to ensure seamless transition. Proposal is currently in operation.</p>
<p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff - improved confidence in engaging with users and their families regarding placements. • Members - improved satisfaction of service users and their families and partner organisations; Improved reputation of Haringey Council. • Provider - enhanced relationship with Brokerage team to ensure strengths based needs are at the centre of negotiations.
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p>
<p>The Council will continue to meet its statutory requirements under the Care Act 2014 and the Children and Families Act 2014, both of which place emphasis on needs assessment, outcomes identification and support planning.</p> <p>Improved knowledge of negotiating care costs with providers supports early help, prevention and wellbeing, promoting independence and supports families to make informed decisions about the care and support needs.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
N/A			

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA6

Title of Option:	Day Opportunities – transfer of high cost out of borough placements into borough		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	John Everson
Affected Service(s):	Adults Social Care	Contact / Lead:	James Cuthbert

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

The Council has three ex-day centre premises that, with certain adaptations, could be leased to a local provider to support 15-20 of these high cost service users at reduced cost, and closer to their existing support networks.

This could yield £540,000 in savings in full year 2020/21, depending on:

- Which service users move to the new service
- The outcome of the procurement exercise
- The capacity of the service to support a higher number of service users by using the leased premises as a 'hub' to support more service users.

There will be a capital outlay requirement of approximately £177k and a £10-15k social work resource requirement to manage (on a 3-4 month basis), the transition/support planning process of moving service users from out of borough back into area.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	2019/20 £000s	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s
New net additional savings (year on year)	0	525			

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i>
Service users and families accessing out of area placements at high cost will be supported to access the new service in borough and involved in the co-design process to ensure the new service meets need. There may be negative perceptions about the change from families which will need a robust co-production process to overcome.
What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i>
Enabling service users in out of area arrangements to take up services in borough may have impacts on the viability of the out of area services. However, the impact of this would not be significant as there is a plural market in third sector and private sector day opportunities services, and the leasing of an in-borough day centre premises to a provider will further diversify our in-borough market to supplement any capacity loss out of area.
How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
None of the day centres will be suitable for the designated service user group	M	M	Feasibility and works to be conducted.
Savings will be lower than anticipated because the procurement process fails to identify more cost-effective alternatives	M	M	Full market engagement exercise required.
Savings will be lower than anticipated because the Council is unable to support high-cost service users to access in-borough arrangements	M	M	Extensive programme of engagement required, with input from SW resource.

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA7

Title of Option:	Sexual health projection.		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	Akeem Ogunyemi
Affected Service(s):	All	Contact / Lead:	Sarah Hart

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Proposal

Sexual Health has the largest allocation within the public health budget and is a high-risk budget in terms of variation, as it is primarily comprised of demand-led services. The council is legally bound to provide open access sexual health services. Many residents use services outside of Haringey. The proposal is to offer up savings based on the efficiencies already achieved and for this to form the baseline budget 2019-20. Beyond this growth in the need for a service will be absorbed by channel shift from high cost services to self-testing.

Background

Spiralling demand and high unit price led public health to develop a local step change program and be part of a London wide re-commissioning program. In 2017, public health reshaped its provision and went to tender for a local young people's service, BME outreach service, healthy living pharmacies and GP services, plus a shared North Central London services. Channel shift to these services created MTFs savings. Further savings are likely to come in 2018 from new on line testing services and a fairer tariff in clinics outside of NCL.

Growth – there is some uncertainty in knowing what the growth in demand has been because the channel shift and the old systems of demand capture are very different. 3.5% growth has been factored in which counter balance 15%-30% channel shift to less expensive routes of service delivery.

Savings summary:

There will be a net recurrent saving of £267k from 2019/20 onwards

1. Financial benefits summary

2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Savings	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>					
Existing Budget	5,450	5,183	5,183	5,163	5,163
Proposed net expenditure after savings	5,183	5,183	5,183	5,163	5,163
Savings	267	0	0	0	0
New net additional savings (year on year)	0	0	0	0	0

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)

Customers- savings are the result of a transformation program that has been a gradual ‘step change’, moving at the pace of residents adapting to using different types of sexual health services – i.e. pharmacies, young people’s service, to on line kits. Ongoing savings are coming from Commissioners having re negotiated a new tariff for out of area providers.

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
List both positive and negative impacts.

We are not expecting any further changes to services.

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?

The savings outlined in this template are a result of a better than anticipated shift away from acute GUM services. This is a result of a transformation that has already been planned in sexual health services in Haringey, and has been through relevant governance and consultation, which have outlined the benefits and risks.

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Sexual health services are demand-led	H	M	Regular review and profiling of activity. Communications about new cost-effective ways of accessing services (e.g. home testing kits)

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA8

Title of Option:	Drug and alcohol savings with contribution to preventative services for adults and families, targeting health inequalities		
Priority:	People	Responsible Officer:	Sarah Hart/Will Maimaris
Affected Service(s):	Drugs and alcohol services	Contact / Lead:	Sarah Hart

Description of Option:

Investment of drug and alcohol savings in preventative services for adults and families, targeting health inequalities

Retendering of the three core substance misuse adult contracts has created savings, available from January 2019. Savings come from a market price adjustment on the recovery service. Also through taking the employment services out of the contract, now funded until 2020 by the Department of Work and Pensions Individual Placement Support pilot. The cabinet report on the re-tendering process stated in the finance comments that proposals would be developed on how these savings would be used for investment in areas to improve health and wellbeing. We propose that we split the savings between cashable savings and investments in preventative services that reduce health inequalities and have a medium term return on investment for the council.

Table 1 shows that there will be a recurrent net saving related to reduced commissioning costs across the three years of £400k. The remaining funding will be held back for investment in schemes which prevent ill health in adults and families and have a specific focus on health inequalities. For these services, business cases will be developed for consideration, with a need to show returns on investment by 2021-22 to the council.

	Year 1 2019-20	Year 2 2020-21	Year 3 2021-22	Year 4 2022-3	Year 3 2021-22
Direct savings from reduced commissioning costs	£400k (recurrent)	£0	£0	£0	£450k
Invest	£200k (recurrent) including £142k in year 1 only for existing planned investment in targeted lifestyle services for adults	£0	£0	£0	£250k
ROI return from adults or children's social care budgets	£0	£0	To be included in the business case aim for recurrent £100k net saving	To be included in the business case aim for £100k recurrent net saving	To be included in the business case £100k net saving

Table 1 the savings achieved from the investment in reduction of use of high cost services.

Haringey public health now have a strong track record in identifying ROI programs and producing savings, not from limiting access but shifting demand e.g. alcohol hospital liaison services, enhanced home detox and the sexual health transformation.

Public health have scoped a number of potential areas for ROI. By May 2019 public health could rank these in terms of ROI and provide a business case. Below are some of the areas we would like to explore – many of which have a focus on families, – we would look to also scope plans which specifically reduce demand on adult social care.

- **Program of Individual Placement Support (IPS).** The national IPS trials in substance misuse and mental health will show if there is sufficient ROI from IPS. The savings will come in employment spring boarding more residents successfully through a Council funded program, this could be substance misuse treatment or homeless services.
- **Pause.** This is a national program that tackles vulnerable women having multiple pregnancies, which end in repeated social care interventions. Intermediate savings would come from a reduction care proceeding.
- **Program for children of dependent parents.** If Haringey is not successful in the innovation fund bid then we could fund the project with the savings. The ROI is potentially rapid on this project in terms of children’s social care costs and a future return on adult substance misuse budgets

Public health would work with finance to create a business case for any investment by May 2019 with a clear outline of where savings would be realised (adults vs childrens)

Why would the Council agree to invest to save rather than disinvestment? This option has two advantages for the Council, firstly being able to demonstrate investment in innovative prevention programs. Secondly, by exploring a small investment in years 1 and 2 public health deliver can potentially deliver savings in high cost social care budgets that will create a permanent shift in spend.

Funding for substance misuse services comes from the ring fenced public health grant, a return for which has to be provided to Public Health England (PHE) annually. Whilst recognising localism, there is significant scrutiny by PHE on substance misuse spend and wider public health spend and performance so any disinvestment would be questioned.

Summary of net savings:

- Year 1: 2019/20 - £400k net recurrent savings from commissioning costs**
- Year 3: 2021/22 – Additional £100k recurrent savings from return on investments – e.g. reductions in looked after children, reduction in adult social care costs.**
- Year 4: 2022/23 – Additional £100k recurrent savings from return on investment**

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Existing Budget	4,300	0	0	0	0
Proposed net expenditure after savings	3,900	0	0	0	0
Savings	400	0	0	0	0
New net additional savings (year on year)	400	0	0	100	100

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?
List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant

Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)

Commissioning savings have already been realised with the expectation that outcomes will not be negatively impacted.

The impact of new investments would be scoped and evaluated including an EqlA but would be targeted at reducing health inequalities

Potential positive contributions to the following borough plan outcomes:

Outcome 5: Happy childhood: all children across the borough will be happy and healthy as they grow up, feeling safe and secure in their family and in our community

Outcome 8: All adults are able to live healthy and fulfilling lives, with dignity, staying active and connected in their communities

a) Healthy life expectancy will increase across the borough, improving outcomes for all communities

c) Adults will feel physically and mentally healthy and well

d) Adults with multiple and complex needs will be supported to achieve improved outcomes through a coordinated partnership approach

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?

Commissioning savings have already been realised with the expectation that outcomes will not be negatively impacted. This has already been through cabinet in October 2018.

The impact of new investments would be scoped and evaluated and we would engage with partners on any proposals.

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?

Provision of drugs and alcohol support services are a condition of the Council's Public Health Grant. These will be continue to be delivered.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?

Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Commissioning savings	I	I	There will be a robust service user led process to ensure that the changes in delivery do not impact negatively on service users. The Commissioner will monitor the implementation of the new contract on a monthly basis. The service user network will help to support and service users through the transition to the new service
Return on Investment	TBD	TBD	