

Item No:	Classification: OPEN	Date: 7 February 2011	Meeting Name: Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Report Title:		Call-in: Gateway 2 - Contract Award Approval - Home Care Services In Southwark (Cabinet 25 January 2011)	
Ward(s) or Group affected:		All	
From:		Head of Overview & Scrutiny	

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. On 25 January 2011 the cabinet and leader considered a report on the Gateway 2 - Contract Award Approval - Home Care Services In Southwark (included as appendix).
2. The cabinet agreed:
 1. That the award of home care service contracts to the following suppliers for a period of 3 years from 6 April 2011 with an estimated cost between £10,813,500 and £30,680,688 be approved. (Contract costs are based on calculations explained in paragraphs 8 - 12 of the report).

Contract	Supplier Name
Universal Contract 1	London Care
Universal Contract 2	Enara Community Care
Specialist Contract 5 – Continuing Drinkers and Acquired Brain Injury	Enara Community Care

2. That there be no contract award for the third universal contract, as based on current trends, the council does not consider there will be sufficient demand for council-arranged care to meet the guaranteed minimum hours for three contracts.
3. That there be no contract award for the older adult support in Southwark (OASIS) service and the intermediate care and neurological-rehabilitation (neuro-rehab) service as the bids for these services are not affordable. (Alternative service options were discussed in the report).
3. The leader agreed:
 4. That delegated authority be given to the cabinet member for health and adult social care to approve up to 2 single year (1 + 1) extension options that can be operated at the end of the initial term of the contract subject to satisfaction with each supplier's performance and demand for services

REASONS FOR CALL-IN

4. On 2 February 2011 the Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee - Councillor Lisa Rajan - and three members of the committee (Councillors David Hubber, Tim McNally and Paul Noblet) requested a call-in of the decision on the following grounds:

“The link between strategy and implementation has not been maintained, and the outcome of this decision is disproportionate to the action taken:

1. The decision contradicts the Council's agreed policy of protecting services for vulnerable people, as stated in A Fairer Future for All in Southwark, because it did not let two of the specialist contracts and does not give a satisfactory explanation of how these needs will be alternatively and adequately met.
2. The decision advocates two compromises on quality of care that will adversely impact on vulnerable people, contrary to the Council's agreed policy in A Fairer Future For All in Southwark.
3. Letting only two out of the three main contracts leads to increased risk for the Council if one of the contractors experiences problems with quality, CQC rating or service delivery.”

CALL-IN MEETING

5. The committee will consider the call-in request and in particular whether or not the decision might be contrary to the policy framework or not wholly in accordance with the budget.
6. If, having considered the decision and all relevant advice, the committee is still concerned about it then it may either:
 - a) refer it back to the decision making person or body for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns, or
 - b) refer the matter to council assembly if the decision is deemed to be outside the policy and budget framework.
7. If the committee does not refer the matter back to the decision making person or body, the decision shall take effect on the date of the scrutiny meeting.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held at	Contact
Report to Cabinet 25 January 2011	160 Tooley Street London SE1 2TZ	Everton Roberts Constitutional Team 020 7525 7221

APPENDICES

Cabinet report

Audit Trail

Lead Officer	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	
Report Author	Peter Roberts, Scrutiny Project Manager	
Version	Final	
Dated	1 February 2011	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Communities, Law & Governance	No	-
Cabinet Member	No	-