

FINAL	Title CONSULTATION RESPONSES KEY THEMES FOR: “Open Access Services – Supporting People to be Active Citizens”.
Date 6 July 2011	Author and key contact Taylor Jakks – Commissioning Officer 020 7525 0374

INTRODUCTION

1. This purpose of this paper is to highlight the key themes of feedback received during the consultation on “Open Access Services – Supporting People to be Active Citizens”.
2. The paper gives a brief overview of the proposals followed by a summary of key themes arising from the consultation process. It goes on to provide additional information on the ways in which feedback was received.

SUMMARY OF PROCESS TO DATE

3. There are a number of day and community support services run by the voluntary sector for older people, particularly day centres and lunch clubs (see Appendix A). Although a number of people who attend may have eligible adult social care needs, the services are also open to those without eligible needs.
4. The council’s approach to re-shaping these open access day services is considered within the context of wider service transformation across adult social care and the financial position of the council over the next few years. It aligns with our overall approach to day services, focusing on people coming together to access support in one place, using creative ways of meeting their assessed needs within available resources, rather than a focus on individual buildings.
5. We want to support a more self-sustaining set of open access services that can deliver the council’s vision for personalisation and promoting health, wellbeing and independence for people at risk of needing, or accessing, adult social care support.
6. Initial proposals for re-shaping day services to support this and deliver savings, given the financial position of the council, were published in January 2011. They outlined a phased approach. Proposals were published in advance of the budget being agreed by Council Assembly to give organisations time to engage and respond as overall timescales for delivery of savings were very tight.
7. The consultation period closed on 19 April 2011 (following an extension). During this period formal responses were received from a number of organisations, including a very high level alternative proposal from the voluntary sector day services providers’ forum, supported by Community Action Southwark (CAS). A range of meetings were also held with affected organisations with council officers, senior council officers and members of the Cabinet. Affected organisations were asked to work with their customers and families in forming responses.

8. In addition, a scrutiny meeting held on 4 May 2011 sought to discuss the overall council approach and the future of day services for older people, including these proposals.

OVERVIEW OF INITIAL PROPOSALS

9. Below is a brief summary of the consultation paper *Open Access Services: Supporting People to be Active Citizens*¹ published in January 2011.
10. In 2010/11 Southwark spent £2.3 million on voluntary sector community support services that include:
 - day support and lunch clubs
 - information and advice
 - befriending
 - advocacy
4. The council's agreed Policy and Resources Strategy mean that savings of £1m are required for open access services in 2011/12 and then a further £300,000 in 2012/13. This is part of a total of £7.75m savings required across health and community services in 2011/12 alone.
5. The council issued initial proposals for re-shaping services to achieve the required savings, in line with the principles for more effective, personalised services that enabled people to live independently and well for as long as possible. A brief summary of the proposals is below.
6. The proposals recognised that there would be some people with eligible care needs who may be accessing services from affected organisations. The paper noted that, as proposals were developed and assessments/reviews took place, customers would be offered personal budgets to enable them to make decisions about the care and support they wanted to access in the future.

Stage 1: Re-shaping day support and lunch clubs

7. Reduce the council contribution towards this provision from £1.3m to £300,000.
8. This would be achieved by reducing the number of groups that received a block council funding contributions and concentrate services on three hubs, working with other organisations to make best use of resources and offer personalised, effective and innovative services to local residents. Of the 12 services currently running, two were identified to receive future council contributions at the same level with the potential to operate as hubs. The two sites were:
 - Golden Oldies Community Care Project, Camberwell
 - Goose Green, East Dulwich
9. It was also proposed that the Age Concern Yalding Health Living Centre in Bermondsey would continue to operate as a third hub with PCT funding.

¹ http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200308/current/2082/adult_social_care_service_consultation

10. In addition, the council would invite all groups to bid for part of an Innovation Fund of £200,000, in 2011/12, to support organisations in changing and adapting their business models through small injections of cash to support them to be financially self-sustaining in the longer-term.

Stage 2: A new approach to community support services

11. Decommission current contracts for advice, information befriending and advocacy projects (to take effect from April 2012) and invite local organisations to bid against a new specification for services that support delivery of personalisation and health and well being to a value of £700,000 (saving a further £300,000).

KEY THEMES FROM CONSULTATION RESPONSES

12. Direct feedback on the consultation was received from various sources

Source of feedback	Number of responses
Service users and family	4
Stage 1 providers	10
Stage 2 providers	1
Stakeholders	7

13. Feedback was received directly from a small number of services users and carers/family members. However, all provider organisations were asked to gather feedback from service users and families or carers and use it to shape their response.
14. Feedback considered was sent to the consultation email address, discussed at the providers' consultation event and providers' meetings with senior council officers and discussed at the Older People's Partnership Board.
15. Further information on the consultation process, including a timeline, can be found in Appendix B.
16. A summary of the key themes arising from this feedback is outlined below. Appendix C provides some more detail on the key feedback themes and clarifies any issues of accuracy or action from the council perspective.
17. In addition, consideration of the equality impacts is continuing to be developed and will be used to inform final decision-making. This will include consideration of any key equality issues raised through consultation feedback.

Overall response to proposed savings requirements

18. There was general recognition that the council has less money available to spend on services and that therefore there would need to be some element of change. (All stage 1 and stage 2 providers that responded as well as three stakeholders)
19. However there was some concern from many of the day services/lunch club providers and some stakeholders, about the timescale for implementing the changes. The key concerns were around not having sufficient time for organisations to change and develop their business models and come up with

alternative proposals by the time contracts had ended (which was due to be by the middle of April 2011). (All stage 1 providers that responded, plus three stakeholders)

20. In addition, a number of stage 1 providers (4) and all the service users/family responses (4) asked for there to be no cuts in funding at all. A number of stakeholders (3) requested that the savings required were reduced and to be delivered over a longer timescale, including making use of council reserves for ongoing support.
21. The council has already taken steps to respond to this. At the Council Assembly meeting on 22 February, councillors voted to provide some transitional support to the day services/lunch clubs affected by the savings requirement. An amount of £0.5m has been made available from council reserves to cover the period April to August 2011. This was designed to acknowledge the concern of organisations and give them some 'breathing space' to discuss further with their members and explore alternative options.
22. The expectation is that groups would work with each other and the council to use this period of short-term funding to develop cost-effective, sustainable ways of operating within the resources available, and to explore other avenues.
23. In light of this, the consultation period was also extended until 19 April to ensure that further work could be done by organisations in forming their responses.
24. It is important to recognise that all of the affected day services/lunch clubs have access to organisational reserves, to which council funding is likely to have contributed. In informal conversations with organisations as part of this process, a number have suggested that they would be able to operate for a further period after current council funding arrangements ceased by making use of some of their reserves, as they continued to work to develop future business models.
25. The council recognises the key role that carers play both in delivering care and in preventing people's needs from increasing. The council is planning to develop proposals for effective, targeted interventions that can provide help and support for carers. It is also working with carers' representatives to target commissioning activity through a carers' hub. This is anticipated to provide a more effective service and place greater emphasis upon locating and supporting carers who are in crisis and in greatest need.
26. Finally, providers (2) and stakeholders (2) felt it was important that the voluntary sector day services should not be considered in isolation and needed to be part of an approach that encompassed other day services and opportunities across the borough.
27. The council fully recognises the need to understand impact in a range of areas, given the level of savings required across all council services. This is why proposals are being discussed on a range of areas with, for example relevant partnership boards and consultations published to allow a wide range of people to contribute and engage.

28. In addition, officers will continue to work together with operational teams and partners in thinking about the future of service provision in line with the overall vision for adult social care and to inform strategic commissioning decisions

The terminology used does not recognise the breadth of services

29. There was concern expressed by a number of the stage 1 providers (5) that the term 'lunch clubs' does not encompass the full extent of the support provided by many of the organisations.
30. The consultation paper deliberately used broad terms such as 'day services' and 'lunch clubs' in an attempt to prevent too narrow an interpretation of the services on offer. In addition, it is important to note that a number of the organisations are only open for specific periods of time or days of the week, so not universally accessible. During the various face to face meetings held during the consultation process officers and councilors were able to speak to organisations directly around the types of services provided, and indeed the providers themselves had the opportunity to demonstrate the range of opportunities available.
31. There were also some requests for clarity over the terminology and language used in the consultation document (this was a discussion at the providers' consultation event where all directly affected stage 1 and 2 providers were represented). Regular conversations and engagement meetings during the consultation process were used to clarify and explain key issues in the consultation document through face to face discussion with organisations.
32. Some areas of the consultation were also designed to enable organisations to put forward proposals and suggestions for how best to achieve the savings, and key things to consider in finalising proposals. It was expected that organisations would constructively contribute to this by offering their own ideas through consultation feedback.
33. In addition, the consultation paper did highlight that there would be some people using these services with eligible care and support needs. During the consultation period the council completed further scoping work with affected organisations to further understand the level of needs of people utilising services.
34. This exercise has shown that there are potentially more than expected people with eligible care needs being supported by these services. In line with our overall approach to moving towards more personalised, effective services that give people choice and control over the care and support they access, it will be important to enable people with eligible needs to move onto personal budgets in a timely way. This should support people to be able to choose culturally appropriate services that best meet their needs, recognising the diverse range of provision in the borough. It is also important to consider this spread across a number of different organisations in terms of further developing proposals.
35. The scoping work has already given organisations an indicative understanding of the number of people using their services that may be able to take advantage of personal budgets. This should support them in planning and developing appropriate means to use this shift, for example charging mechanisms. It is also important that the process of re-assessment is

undertaken in a timely way to enable people with eligible care needs to move onto personal budgets.

36. The council also recognises that work to evaluate individual budgets and direct payments has outlined that some groups, such as older people or those with mental health needs, may require particular support to access the benefits of personal budgets². It is therefore vital that the right mechanisms are in place to make sure that they can make the most of the opportunities for personal budgets.

37. This includes:

- focus on how we can support the development of a diverse provider market in Southwark so there are appropriate services available on which people can spend their personal budgets
- access to good quality advice and information for people that recognises they may need to access information in different ways so that they can understand and make decisions around care and support and make best use of resources, regardless of whether they receive state support for care
- a focus on support planning so that people can identify how best to meet their needs and achieve the outcomes they want, with the development of an effective brokerage service that people can use to then access services
- availability of support and advice on the implications of managing their own money (through a range of providers and support organisations), including payroll and employment requirements, etc.

Hub model proposal

38. There was a mixed response to the hub approach. While a number of responses (4 stage 1 providers, 2 stage 2 providers and 3 stakeholders) expressed support for the concept, there was less consensus on the sites that would be most appropriate to be hubs. Overall, there was not general agreement for the hubs proposed in the consultation document, in terms of suitability, capacity and infrastructure to deliver person-centred services.

39. A number of the Stage 1 organisations (2) saw an opportunity to retain their service by becoming one of the hub sites.

40. There was also concern expressed that the 'Lattice Foundation' (an initiative by Community Action Southwark) to share back office functions and reduce overhead costs, referred to in the consultation paper, was not fully developed and therefore, not ready to be utilised. (Discussion at the providers' consultation event)

41. Part of the consultation feedback was an alternative proposal, drafted by the voluntary sector day services provider forum, led by Community Action Southwark and Age Concern Lewisham and Southwark. This included a preferred option of two hubs in existing centres, developed to provide meeting space and days for specific organisations/groups by agreement.

42. However, it was not clear that all partners had come together to support this approach and there was little detail on the financial and business case.

² *Evaluation of the Individual Budget pilot programme: final report*, Glendinning et al., 2008

43. The council therefore recognises that there remain opportunities for relevant organisations to work together and develop a robust proposal to support a model that promotes community cohesion while recognising above points about people being able to choose culturally appropriate services that best meet their own needs. There are also clearly some opportunities for organisations to think about how they can best share resources to maximum benefit.

Innovation Fund

44. There were no negative comments regarding the proposal for an innovation fund.
45. Some of the feedback (1 stage 2 provider and 1 stakeholder) noted some points around alternative opportunities for people that offered relevant support activities, for example registered social landlord sites. The council agrees that it is important to think of opportunities for people in the wider context, and the sorts of services that help people to self-support in the future, in line with the overall vision for adult social care.

Proposals for the future of community support services

46. There were no negative comments about the proposals for stage 2 community support services (information & advice, advocacy & befriending). There were some helpful suggestions about ensuring that related services are included in an overarching approach. This included the importance of good information and advice for all, regardless of whether people self-fund or not.
47. The council recognises this and is already taking forward work to develop a single information and advice portal for adult social care. It is also important to consider these links across the range of services available.

Appendix A – List of directly affected organisations

Stage 1 – lunch clubs and day services

Age Concern – Stones End Day Centre
Age Concern – Black Elders
Age Concern – Long Weekenders
Age Concern – Healthy Aging
BEGs
BEGs Somali Group
Cypriot Day Centre
Golden Oldies Community Care Project
Goose Green Lunch Club
South Asian Elderly Organisation
Southwark Irish Pensioners Project
Southwark Vietnamese/Chinese Community

Stage 2 – community support services

Age Concern – Community Support
Alzheimer's Society
Cambridge House
Dulwich Helpline
Southwark Churches
Time & Talents
SDA – Community Support
Blackfriars Settlement

Appendix B – further information on consultation process

The consultation process covered a number of specific areas. These are outlined below.

Service providers

Voluntary sector organisations that currently provide services in both stage 1 and stage 2 were directly asked to consider and respond to the consultation paper.

Providers were invited to request one to one meetings with the Head of Adult Commissioning – two of which were requested and took place, with an additional five meetings requested and held with other officers.

A providers' consultation event (stage 1 & 2) was held on 23 February 2011.

Cllr Dixon-Fyle met with stage 1 providers individually during March 2011.

Stage 1 providers were invited to two combined/group meetings with senior council officers during March and April 2011.

Service users

Many people who access these services have lower levels of need, and have a direct relationship with the provider, but not the council.

Service providers were asked to discuss the proposals with all of their service users and either feedback as part of their organisation's feedback or encourage their service users to respond directly themselves.

Organisations were informed that service users with assessed eligible care needs would be consulted as part of their assessment/reviews, and organisations were asked to indicate where they believe their service users are already receiving eligible services, or may have eligible care needs

Other consultation/stakeholders

Opinions on the proposal have also been obtained from other sources. These include:

- a) the consultation paper was published on the council's web site with details of the open access consultation email address for feedback
- b) the Older People's Partnership Board (OPPB) at the meeting on 9 February 2011

- c) a letter to the lead cabinet member for Health and Social Care sent from the chair of trustees of a voluntary sector provider
- d) letters, emails and telephone requests to the Head of Adult Commissioning from affected organisations, service users and family/friends
- e) Support & Care Market Forum members
- f) meetings held with voluntary organisations not directly affected by funding proposals in this consultation.

The views obtained from these sources are also considered as part of the overall consultation process.

The table below shows the activity and timing for the consultation process with the addition of the specific additional funding allocated to stage 1 organisations to allow more time for changes to service models.

Activity	Timing
1. Letters to stage 1 organisation currently receiving funding on expiry of contracts and 12 weeks' notice period (to 19 April 2011)	25 January 2011
2. General publication of consultation paper Requested details of FACs eligible service users from groups	26 January 2011
3. Council assembly agrees specific ring-fenced funding to be made available to adult social care voluntary sector lunch clubs/day centres	22 February 2011
4. Consultation engagement event with sector	23 February 2011
5. Meeting of Cabinet member and senior council officers with representatives from affected voluntary sector lunch clubs/day centres	2 March 2011
6. Individual provider organisations meeting with Cllr Dixon-Fyle	During March
7. Deadline for organisations wishing to access ring-fenced funding in form of contract extension to inform council	7 March 2011
8. Second group meeting with Cllr Dixon-Fyle & Sarah McClinton, Deputy Director of Adult Social Care	13 April 2011
7. Scoping work around indicative numbers of service users with eligible care needs	March – May 2011
8. Consultation closes (Extended from 23 March)	19 April 2011
13. End of period of ring-fenced additional funding for voluntary sector lunch clubs/day services	August 2011

Appendix C – SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION FEEDBACK AND CLARIFICATIONS

Note: The ‘Clarifications’ column is used to clarify any points of accuracy, and update on where actions have already been taken to address the issue. Gaps are either where a comment is positive or accepted, or there is no particular action required.

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
Savings requirements	Requests not to close the centres	Service user and families	Several requests were made not to ‘close the day centres’.	Proposals are about reducing the council’s contribution to services. As these are not council-run services this is not wholly the council’s decision around future operation. A number of providers have indicated they could continue with alternative sources of funding, or make use of available organisational reserves while further developing business models.
	Reduce funding by 25% only – but continue to fund	Stakeholders	A request to recognise the preventative work that the centres undertake – whilst recognising the need for saving money.	
	Continue to fund at present levels	Providers	Some providers requested the continuation of funding at current levels.	
	Some stage 1 affected providers would manage to continue providing services	Providers	Two providers have said they would continue to provide services without any on-going funding. Most providers said they would be able to continue to provide services with an income stream from personal budgets.	
	Notice period for cessation of funding too short	Providers and stakeholders	Providers & Stakeholders commented that the timeframes for the consultation and the cessation of funding is much too short. Not enough time to change their business models or find alternative funding options. Some providers suggested that funding should continue at current levels until March 2012. Stakeholders suggested that funding should continue beyond 2012/13 with a minimal cut in on-going funding.	

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
Savings requirements (continued)	Cuts are being implemented 'too fast & too deep'	Providers	<p>Several providers suggested that cuts are being implemented too fast, and the cuts are too deep, especially for BME groups who may not have support opportunities outside the day service.</p> <p>Suggestion of gradual reduction of funding over two years for BME groups – using council reserves.</p>	<p>Council Assembly voted to make available £0.5m from council reserves to give day services/lunch club providers additional time and space to consider business models.</p> <p>Discussions have been ongoing since January 2011 so organisations well aware of the need for change</p> <p>Council aware this a challenging time for all organisations, and the council is having to make significant savings across all services.</p> <p>This is part of a £7.75million savings required for health and community services in 2011/12 alone.</p>
	Service user assessments	Providers	<p>Robust assessments should be undertaken for all FACs eligible service users – and this should be done before cessation of funding so that providers can build their business model knowing what level of income they can expect from personal budgets.</p>	<p>Details of service users have been requested/received from all providers.</p> <p>Outcome of initial scoping work will be used to inform any decisions.</p> <p>Reviews/assessments will be undertaken on all eligible service users – and personal budgets will be offered where eligible need is identified</p>

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
Savings requirements (continued)	Fundraising	Service user and providers	Funding applications for voluntary sector providers is often reliant on the organisation receiving funding from the council. Loss of council funding could restrict opportunities for other funding.	The council's community engagement team is (with Community Action Southwark) mapping the added value council investment brings and will then do more work with large funders (e.g. Big Lottery) to improve success rates and maximise the value and leverage of investment.
	Risk of more people with eligible needs	Stakeholder/ providers	Some stakeholders and many providers suggested that less funding for preventative services would result in more people developing higher levels of need – and fail to identify people who are beginning to experience difficulty coping with being independent.	Is important that any preventative service is focused on effective, evidence-based interventions and appropriately targeted. Appreciate the potential benefits of preventative services but also need to make sure they are focused on the most effective areas.
	Support for carers	Service users, family and providers	5 x Carer/Family members responded by saying the centres are a 'lifeline' for them. Some centres allow for a safe environment – allowing Carers to continue to work or take a break from their caring responsibilities. Without this the caring role would break down.	Southwark is developing a carers' hub that will identify carers earlier and support them in their caring role. Carers' assessments are also available for carers in their own right about potential information or support to enable them to continue in their caring role.
	Limiting Choice	Stakeholder	Unease that people using personal budgets will face	Personal budgets can actually

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
			higher prices and less choice as the market constricts.	enable a more diverse market than previously, with new roles, such as personal assistants, beginning grow. Will remain a role for the council in supporting the development of a diverse and vibrant market for people to use.
	Impact on Older people	Provider	Cumulative effect of these, other cuts and the rise in the cost of daily living will impact disproportionately on older people.	Impact on equalities will be considered through development of proposals and used to inform final decisions.
Savings requirements (continued)	Self-sustaining	Stakeholders/ Providers	There was mixed feedback about this. One stakeholder said that some Voluntary Sector Organisations cannot be self-sustaining. Some providers said that, given time, they could become self-sustaining (utilising personal budgets were necessary).	
	Impact on Health services	Stakeholder	Further rationing of social services will lead to poorer outcomes moving financial burden to health trusts.	Ongoing work with health colleagues to consider related impacts on services and help to target intervention to make the best of both budgets.
	Unsustainable voluntary sector risk	Stakeholder	If private companies gain in the long term this may make voluntary sector organisations less sustainable.	
	Personal Budgets	Stakeholder	Personal budgets are a less reliable form of funding – so organisations need to maintain a level of core funding. The council should be transparent about what ‘price’ the council will pay to PB holders for day care.	Personal budgets are paid according to level of need and identified person-centred outcomes, which are used to develop a resource allocation.

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
Terminology & breadth of services	Consultation document not accessible	Providers and stakeholders	Most providers (stage 1 & 2) and some stakeholders suggested that the consultation paper was 'jargonistic' and not accessible. Requests for definition of terms.	Range of meetings and engagement opportunities since launch of consultation paper to discuss any issues directly with organisations.
	Indicate Affected Organisations	Stakeholder	The proposals should have indicated which projects the proposals refer to and suggest a cost benefit study and impact assessment.	Letters were sent to all affected organisations along with the consultation proposals so they were aware of who would be affected. Equality analysis being done through consultation process and will take into account appropriate feedback received.
	Requested a new consultation document/process	Provider/ stakeholder	A stakeholder/ provider refuted the implication in the consultation document that day services in Southwark are institutionalised and outmoded. Suggested, they are progressive, person centred and evolutionary. For this reason he suggested a new consultation document and process.	Ongoing work with organisations to engage and discuss issues throughout consultation process.
	More information	Stakeholder	One stakeholder suggested they need further information to comment further: Stage 1: further details/services/figures on proposed sites Stage 2: what services are being decommissioned?	The consultation paper described the services that are the subject of the consultation.
	Existing/New service users	Provider	Current users have relied on these services – some for many years. Changes will take time and need to 'sit alongside' new people.	We recognise that all adult social care transformation needs to be mindful of both existing and new service users, and working with them to maintain independence, and

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
				offer choice and control, which are the key objectives of transformation.
Terminology & breadth of services (continued)	All the centres are not 'Open Access' and not luncheon clubs	Stakeholder and providers	Providers felt services much more than simply a hot meal. Some providers stated that their services are not 'Open Access' – as they receive referrals from social services for people with high levels of need.	Acknowledge that some people accessing services have eligible care needs – but is also important to recognise that people do not have to have eligible care needs in order to access or use the service.
	Preventative effects	Provider	Services provided reduce depression, malnourishment and falls – if these services are removed, so will this effect.	We recognise that there is some national evidence to suggest depression, malnourishment, and falls, do have an impact on people's health and wellbeing. However, evidence is less clear on a specific mechanism that achieves this the best. Interventions need to continually be assessed and appropriately targeted.
	Councillors are unaware of the work that gets done in day centres	Stakeholder/ Provider	Letter received stating that they do not believe Councillors are aware of all the work/activity that takes place and the preventative/support that saves the council funding by maintaining someone's independence.	Senior council officers and Cabinet members have discussed with, and visited stage 1 organisations.

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
Proposed hub model	Suitability of proposed hubs	Providers/ Stakeholders	Not all of the three proposed hub sites are suitable because they cannot accommodate capacity. Of the three only Yalding might have the space and infrastructure.	Final recommendations on proposals will take into account feedback from this consultation and discussions with the voluntary sector.
	Hubs need to be person centred	Providers	Suggest that day care hubs be person centred, that it provide creative and therapeutic activities and opportunities to learn and develop new skills.	Effective, person-centred services that support people to maintain/regain independence are a vital aspect of the vision for the future of adult social care.
	Alternative proposal for hub model/sites	Providers	Counter-proposals made that include day care funded through personal budgets, for those that with eligible care needs and through individual fundraising for moderate and lower level needs – PLUS one <u>new</u> hub in the centre of the borough or two hubs in existing centres – developed for shared use (preferred option for two hubs)	Proposal did not include detailed financial or business case and unclear on number of affected organisations involved – further work required to develop.
	Voluntary sector day services should not be considered in isolation	Providers and stakeholders	A more strategic view should be taken towards day services – both in-house and voluntary sector.	Council agrees on the importance of working together, both internally and with other partners on proposals. Discussion with partnership boards, consultation process, etc, all designed to support this, as well as internal work across the council to inform strategic commissioning decisions.

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
Proposed hub model (continued)	The CAS Lattice model referred to in the proposals is under-developed	Providers	The Lattice model – sharing back-office functions across VSOs is under-developed and not yet ready to provide cost cutting functions.	
	OP day services Hub & Spoke model needs to consider other hubs and ‘fit in’.	Providers	It was noted that other community hub and spoke services are being developed with and without the council – and the proposed hubs should be considered in this context.	
	A generic hub is not suitable for BME groups	Providers	2 x providers suggested that whilst they support the development of a generic OP hub model – there still needs to be BME specific services to support those unwilling/unable to use generic services.	Important to recognise that a generic hub can still recognise/cater for individual needs through shared use/understanding and range of opportunities and activities. Council recognises the diverse nature of people in the borough while also supporting community cohesion and enabling people to engage with local communities. Personal budgets can give people the opportunity to purchase culturally-appropriate services that best meet their needs and identified outcomes. This can be in a range of ways.

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
Proposed hub model (continued)	Proposals are an exciting opportunity and vision for the future.	Stakeholders	2 x stakeholders suggested that the vision is an exciting opportunity and welcome the proposals. They do ask for clarity around: a) Lattice Foundation b) 'Open Access' c) Links with other service areas	
	Asset management	Stakeholder	One stakeholder noted that the hub and spoke model is more akin to asset management strategy rather than an improvement for those in need.	The approach is not just about buildings themselves but about developing a collaborate approach to services focused on improved outcomes for people, outreach and engagement in local communities and independence, rather than individual buildings.
	Assessment of day service benefits	Stakeholders	A proper assessment of the benefits of these centres and the savings they make the council should be undertaken before any cuts are made.	Equality impacts being considered to inform final decision and will consider any specific feedback from this consultation.
	RSLs are keen to host community hub activities and have accessible facilities.	Stakeholders	Many RSL sites have facilities that would support day service activities for some of the groups.	
	Developing social capital	Stakeholder	Engaging and sustaining social capital often requires co-ordination, confidence building and skill development.	A co-ordinated approach by the voluntary sector is encouraged and supported by the council.

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
	Culturally specific volunteers	Providers	Consideration should be given to the fact that volunteers from BAME groups may not be inclined to volunteer for generic OP services.	It is important that people from a range of backgrounds engage with and support services to reflect the diversity in the borough and offer people appropriate services for personalised needs. This should be regardless of the individual setting.
Proposed hub model (continued)	BME groups will be affected more	Providers	<p>Because of cultural and language issues BME groups will be affected more than other groups.</p> <p>For those that cannot speak English the centres provide valuable translation support, enabling people to remain independent.</p> <p>Cultural issues mean that some providers/centres become a trusted support mechanism for their service users (where they may not trust others easily)</p>	<p>Acknowledge that a number of services are for particular BME groups and this will be considered through analysis of equality impacts.</p> <p>Translation and interpretation services are also provided by the council and available to all residents on an ongoing basis. They will continue to be available.</p> <p>It is important for organisations to review their business models and think about effective services that are financially self-sustaining. People with eligible care needs will be offered personal budgets so that they can choose the services they wish to purchase that best meet their needs, including thinking about culturally appropriate services.</p>

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
Innovation Fund	Innovation Fund to be used for development of OP hub	Providers	Several providers suggested the innovation funding should be used for the development of an older person hub. This is a key element of the providers' forum alternative proposal. The Hub should have user groups as members of the management committee.	Subject to final decisions, innovation fund applications could be encouraged from organisations that can work together to offer a hub model of service.
Community Support Services	Unmet need	Stakeholder	How will unmet need be captured?	Open access services can provide support for people to maintain wellbeing and there are also a range of services in the borough for people in addition to these specific services, e.g. Hourbank, Southwark Circle. Community support service will also need to consider how information/advice, etc can contribute to supporting people without eligible needs to maintain wellbeing.
	Monitoring	Stakeholder	How will Southwark monitor whether the needs of the most vulnerable are being met?	This will be monitored as part of the review process and through general outcome measures for social services.
	Service user responsibility	Provider	Proposals rely on individual responsibility as driving determinant – but not all people can do this.	There remains support available for people who are in a position to require it, for example in relation to mental capacity issues, etc.
	Mental Health	Provider	Many service users have unidentified mental health issues because they have never been assessed properly due to language issues.	All eligible service users will be reviewed/assessed and offered a personal budget where appropriate.

Theme	Feedback Issue	Raised by whom	Detail of Feedback	Clarifications
	Information and advice	Stakeholder	Noted the importance of offering information and advice to those who are below FACs criteria.	This is a key aspect of a hub model of service and community support services.
	On-line market place		They also suggested that IT infra-structure needs to be in place to inform people about service opportunities (i.e. on-line market place)	Ongoing development of a single point of contact for adult social services – information and advice available to people is an important part of this.
	What is success in outcomes?		Work needs to take place to work out how to measure successful outcomes. What is success?	The department's priorities and key outcomes measurements are highlighted in the departmental plan produced by health and community services.
	Partnership working	Stakeholder	Further partnership working needs to be developed and will take time.	Partnership working is vital and the council continues to support this in all areas, working directly with partners and encouraging them to work together themselves to develop effectively in the future.
Community support services	Safeguarding	Stakeholder	The proposals indicate a potential loss of accountability and safeguarding.	New models of service will include risk mitigation and enable positive risk taking.
	Transport	Stakeholder	Transportation issues need to be considered as part of any new model of day care.	This will be considered in any equality analysis.