

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)					
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)	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.