

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

HELD AT 5.30 P.M. ON MONDAY, 20 MAY 2019

**ROOM C3, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE
CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG**

Members Present:

Councillor James King (Chair)	
Councillor Sufia Alam	Scrutiny Lead for Children & Education
Councillor Kahar Chowdhury	Scrutiny Lead for Health & Adults
Councillor Dipa Das	Scrutiny Lead for Housing & Regeneration
Councillor Marc Francis	
Councillor Tarik Khan	Scrutiny Lead for Resources & Finance
Councillor Eve McQuillan	Bethnal Green Ward
Councillor Bex White	Scrutiny Lead for Community Safety & Environment
Councillor Andrew Wood	

Co-opted Members Present:

Neil Cunningham	Parent Governors
Ahmed Hussain	Parent Governors
Fatiha Kassouri	Parent Governors
Dr Phillip Rice	Church of England Representative

Other Elected Members Present:

Mayor John Biggs	
Councillor Candida Ronald	Cabinet Member for Resources and the Voluntary Sector)

Apologies:

Joanna Hannan	Representative of Diocese of Westminster
Khoyrul Shaheed	Muslim Faith Community

Officers Present:

Sharon Godman	(Divisional Director, Strategy, Policy and Performance)
Adam Boey	(Senior Strategy & Policy Manager - Corporate)
Daniel Kerr	(Strategy and Policy Manager)

Neville Murton
Brian Snary
David Knight

Corporate Director, Resources)
Financial Accountant - Resources
(Senior Democratic Services Officer)

1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest were received.

2. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

2.1 Minutes - 20th May, 2019

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 20th May, 2019 were approved as a correct record of the proceedings.

3. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS

The Committee was advised that no requests to submit any petition's had been received for consideration at this meeting.

4. FORTHCOMING DECISIONS

The Committee received and noted the published Cabinet Forward.

5. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

Nil items

6. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION

6.1 Scrutiny Appointments and Terms of Reference

The Committee received a report regarding the establishment of the Scrutiny Sub-Committees and Appointment of Members to those Sub-Committees.

The Committee then asked a number of questions about the proposals and the points raised are summarised below:

The Committee:

- Indicated that there was merit in considering the establishment of a task and finish group, that would specifically looks at environmental issues to ensure that the Borough is a pleasant place to live for all;
- Agreed that the Council's scrutiny of grants process should now be discharged through the main Overview and Scrutiny Committee under the remit of the Scrutiny Lead for Resources. This would ensure that the decision-making process would remain transparent, accountable and inclusive;

- Formally thanked Kim Hayman and Sue Kenten for their contributions to the work of the Grants Scrutiny Sub-Committee; and
- Asked if it was possible to consider the co-option of a person or persons on to the Grants Determination (Cabinet) Sub-Committee.

As a result of discussions on the report the Chair moved and it was

RESOLVED:

1. To thank Kim Hayman and Sue Kenten for their contributions to the work of the Grants Scrutiny Sub-Committee;
2. That Councillor Sufia Alam would be Vice-Chair of the Committee and Scrutiny Lead for Children's Services (becoming Scrutiny Lead for Children & Education);
3. That the Scrutiny Lead for Governance (becoming Scrutiny Lead for Community Safety & Environment) would be Councillor Bex White;
4. That the Scrutiny Lead for Health, Adults and Community (becoming Scrutiny Lead for Health & Adults) would be Councillor Kahar Chowdhury;
5. Scrutiny Lead for Place (becoming Scrutiny Lead for Housing & Regeneration) would be Councillor Dipa Das; and
6. Scrutiny Lead for Resources (becoming Scrutiny Lead for Resources & Finance) would be Councillor Tarik Khan.
7. To note the co-option requirements for education in accordance with legislation, as set out at Paragraphs 3.3 to 3.9 of the report;
8. To note that establishment of the Sub-Committees as set out in Appendix 1 to the report;
9. To refer back to the Political Groups for confirmation on the list of Members for the Sub-Committees prior to their formal ratification; and
10. To agree the respective terms of reference as set out in Appendix 2 to the report.

6.2 Revenue and Capital Budget Outturn 2018/19

The Committee received a report that introduced the Draft Provisional Outturn report for 2018/19. It also included details of the Revenue and Capital outturn positions, the projected position of the Dedicated Schools Budget and the Housing Revenue Account and outlines progress made against savings targets as well as other key financial indicators.

The Committee asked a number of questions about the proposals and the points raised are summarised below:

The Committee noted:

- That the Council could choose to monitor its budgetary performance against an alternative timeframe but it is considered that the reporting schedule provides the appropriate balance to allow strategic oversight of the budget by members and to manage the Council's exposure to financial risk;

- That more frequent monitoring is undertaken by officers and considered by individual Service Directors and the Council's Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) including approval of management action;
- That notwithstanding the above, this is the draft outturn report and it is good financial management practice to report this to elected members;
- That the extent that there are options for managing the issues identified, these have been highlighted in the report in order to ensure that the Elected Members have a full picture of the issues and proposed solutions as part of their scrutinising;
- The Capital Board and the Corporate Directors to improve performance are holding people to account for the schemes that they are delivering;
- That the fining of illegally parked cars continues to raise monies to fund improvements/maintenance of the street scene;
- That consideration is being given to finding a value for money way to utilise assets such as Jack Dash House e.g. Property guardianship whereby people are granted accommodation within such a property in exchange for keeping the property under observation and in good condition, with their continued occupation providing a disincentive for the property to be occupied by squatters;
- That the Council are working to mitigate overspends through effective policies in service areas e.g. SEN Review solving SEN Budget pressures with particular reference to the Transport Budget;
- That the Directorates are working to improve recruitment/retention in service areas so as to reduce the need for agency workers;
- Wished to receive a breakdown of the service areas by budget;
- That with regard to the Fair Funding Review there are many factors that drive the demand for and cost of services within London. The overarching drivers, however, relate to deprivation, area costs (linked to London's unique labour and property markets), and London's changing population. Therefore, it is important that the needs assessment within any new funding formula continues to include an area cost adjustment. This is incredibly important for London as the costs of delivering services in the capital and surrounding area are higher as a result its unique property and labour markets;
- That Quarterly Monitoring reports would be provided to the Scrutiny Lead Member for Resources;
- It would receive regular updates on the expenditure on the to turn the former Royal London Hospital site in Whitechapel into the Borough's new Town Hall; and
- Noted that the next meeting of the Town Hall Steering Group would be held on the 10th June, 2019.

As a result of discussions on the report the Chair moved and it was **RESOLVED** to receive and note the Draft Provisional Outturn report for 2018/19.

6.3 Overview and Scrutiny Toolkit

The Committee received and noted a report that presented a draft of the Overview and Scrutiny toolkit 2019-20, which has been developed to replace the outgoing scrutiny toolkit 2016-17. The Committee asked a number of questions about the proposals and the points raised are summarised below:

The Committee:

- Noted that the main purpose of the toolkit is to offer practical guidance for Members, senior leaders and scrutiny support officers when carrying out scrutiny activities;
- Noted that this draft version has been based upon the 2018 -19 Overview and Scrutiny Committees structure and some of the areas that will need to be amended to reflect the new committee structure and portfolios;
- Noted that the toolkit 2019-20 will also provide a practical guide to Members, senior officers and scrutiny support officers;
- Agreed that making the Overview and Scrutiny toolkit 2019-20 accessible to the wider Council will foster and develop a stronger organisational culture of scrutiny **e.g.** how residents get involved more in the scrutiny function and the equality impact of services.

As a result of discussions on the report the Chair moved and it was **RESOLVED** to note the report.

7. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF UNRESTRICTED CABINET PAPERS

The Committee received and noted those questions to be presented at Cabinet by the Chair in relation to unrestricted business on the agenda as an appendices to these minutes.

8. ANY OTHER UNRESTRICTED BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT

RAINE'S FOUNDATION SCHOOL

The Committee noted that recommendations have been put forward that the Council proceeds with a public consultation in June 2019 to close the school in August 2020. The Committee raised a number of questions about the proposals and the points raised are summarised below:

The Committee:

- Wished to see the engagement of parents in the public consultation process;
- Agreed that future of Raines School be included in the Children and Education Work Programme and that the Scrutiny Function is actively improved in the process; and

- Wanted the Sub-Committee to consider as appropriate this issue and its impact across all service areas.

9. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

As the agenda circulated contained no exempt/confidential business and there was therefore no requirement to exclude the press and public to allow for its consideration.

10. EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

Nil items

11. EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

Nil items

12. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL) CABINET PAPERS

Nil items

13. ANY OTHER EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

Nil items

The meeting ended at 8.00 p.m.

**Chair, Councillor James King
Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

Item 6.2 Chrisp street Regeneration Scheme – Land Transfer Matters	
Questions	Response
<p>1. Top of Page 67 notes that there will need to be good working relationships between the developer, residents and businesses. All very well, but how does the council propose to facilitate/ensure that? A short-term blip in retail could turn into a longer-term failure of the market if people who have used it long-term find other alternatives.</p>	<p>The need to ensure the Street Market Traders and Retail Businesses do not suffer from a short- term blip in trading is crucial. We have been advised by our Markets Team that the run up to Xmas is a particularly crucial part of the year for these stakeholders.</p> <p>A Chrisp St Community Liaison Forum will be established to ensure stakeholders are engaged effectively and inclusively. Terms of Reference are to be drafted. And Management Plans will need to be prepared to ensure that any negative impacts of building works close to stakeholders’ premises is minimised as best possible. The previous and proposed approach to engaging with stakeholders is set out further below from the 26 Sept 2018 Cabinet Report.</p> <p>The developer intends to begin initial hoarding works in autumn 2019 with demolition works not fully beginning until early 2020.</p> <p>There are still a number of matters to be resolved relating to use of s203 powers; the CPO process; and land transactions before a robust building works programme can be shared with stakeholders in order for meaningful consultation to take place.</p>

	<p>As part of the pre-CPO engagement process, Council and HARCA officers met with approximately 50 stakeholders on a 1-1 basis during November 2018 – March 2019 to discuss how the CPO might affect them, e.g., having to move home, move business, etc., and stakeholders were written to again setting out the matters that were discussed. All stakeholders were updated on scheme progress in a letter dated 29 April 2019.</p>
<p>2. In Reputational Risks: Ward Councillors need engagement, how do Council officers propose to keep them informed? We have not received a single communication on Chrisp St from Council Officers since my election, and if it were not for updates from Poplar HARCA we would be completely in the dark. This is reflective of a wider issue, flagged in the Comms Challenge session last year, which Ward Councillors are not informed proactively of significant local developments.</p>	<p>The delivery of the scheme is being led by Chrisp Street Development Ltd (a subsidiary of Telford Homes PLC) and Poplar HARCA. We understand that Poplar HARCA have engaged with ward councillors periodically. Officers will be pleased to meet and brief Members on the progress of the Compulsory Purchase Order and other related matters on request. Apologies for this offer not being made sooner.</p>
<p>Item: 6.3 Safeguarding Adults Board Strategy 2019-2024</p>	
<p>Questions</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>1. The Safeguarding Adults Board Strategy (“Strategy”) is welcomed and is much needed.</p> <p>I note that there were 940 safeguarding concerns were received and 699 merited an investigation which is a large amount. The monthly reporting of neglect has doubled from 60 in 2016-17 to 114 in 2018-19.</p>	<p>The role of the Safeguarding Adults Board is to provide strategic leadership across the locality and oversee and coordinate the effectiveness of the safeguarding work of its member and partner agencies. Increased reporting of concerns may</p>

At numerical 3 of the Strategy, emphasis on awareness is welcomed as it also helpfully notes that the true scale of the issue is likely to be larger. Self-neglect too is on the rise. It is noted that staff are provided with the requisite training. Will the Board earmark industry standard/specialist training for family members and friends who are carers and take action for closer collaboration between professionals, family members and friends, and the recipients of care?

demonstrate improved understanding and awareness of safeguarding processes.

There is significant variation across local authorities in respect of the number of safeguarding concerns received, but the number of safeguarding concerns recorded by Tower Hamlets placed it in the middle of the distribution when compared to its most similar CIPFA group of 16 London Boroughs. In 2018/19 the 'conversion rate' of concerns into enquiries in Tower Hamlets was consistent with the national average.

The most common type of abuse in Tower Hamlets is self-neglect (approximately 29% of full safeguarding enquiries) in 2018/19, which is consistent with the national average as demonstrated in the NHS Digital April 2017 to March 2018. The second most common category of abuse is financial abuse (approximately 19% of full enquiries), which is slightly higher than the national average. The third most common category of abuse is psychological (15%) which parallels the national average. Physical abuse is 14% of total enquiries which is lower than the national average. The most common location of abuse is the person's own home (50%) which is consistent with the national average.

The SAB does not direct the resources of its member organisations directly, in Tower Hamlets a new Carer Academy has recently been launched, delivered by the Carers Centre, which

	<p>will support carers to develop their skills and knowledge across a range of subjects.</p> <p>The Adult Safeguarding Lead has also agreed to deliver a learning event for the Carer’s Centre, which could be scoped to include training on self-neglect for family members and friends of vulnerable adults who are carers. A possible outcome of the learning event could be to plan for closer collaboration between professionals and family and friends who are carers.</p>
<p>2. It’s good to see that Bart’s Health NHS Trust staff have been trained in DoL standards, but where does safeguarding those detained under the mental health act fit? Is it within the Safeguarding adult’s board’s remit? If so, how is the trend of rising detentions nationally playing out in Tower Hamlets?</p>	<p>It is possible for any person to raise a safeguarding concern about the welfare or the alleged abuse of a person detained under the Mental Health Act (MHA), including those who are themselves detained.</p> <p>Adult Social Care has placed some 30 + professional social worker staff across the East London Foundation Trust’s Community Mental Health teams working closely alongside the NHS Mental Health Inpatient and community services.</p> <p>This ensures that safeguarding issues that may arise for patients detained under the MHA are well understood and addressed if concerns arise. These safeguarding concerns are reported and overseen (in the same way as for similar concerns in respect of any vulnerable group) by the Safeguarding Adults’ Board multi- agency arrangements.</p> <p>Tower Hamlets has seen an increase in detentions</p>

	under the MHA in line with the national picture.
3. How can you ensure that patient's using Direct Payments (DP) supported care at home are being supported by the right carers when "Real" is decommissioned? What is the alternative support that the council providing?	<p>All Direct Payments under REAL have been transferred to the new provider, People Plus and REAL have written to all users to inform them of the change.</p> <p>All care plans have remained the same; most of the staff have also TUPE'd across from REAL to People Plus so the support from the service has remained the same. People Plus provide a range of ways in which users can access and contact them for support.</p>
Item: 6.5 Quarterly Performance and Improvement Monitoring	
Questions	
<p>1. Has there been any slippage between the manifesto pledges and this? Some of these are weaker than the manifesto pledges (e.g. ensuring there's enough childcare provision vs. an affordable childcare place for every child). Where any why have they become weaker?</p> <p>2. Why is number of LLW jobs created not a metric used to measure the success of business support and efforts to promote support small businesses within the local economy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Strategic Plan 2018/19 (which this performance report relates to) was adopted by Cabinet in July 2018, following a process of integration of manifesto ambitions into the plan. The Strategic Plan is the council's strategic business plan and as such would not reflect the exact wording of political pledges. • The strategic indicator set for the council contains a range of indicators to capture the broad scope of each of the council's eleven strategic outcomes. Strategic indicators serve to cover the breadth of the outcome and in 2018/19 we took a first step to including indicators which are more clearly

<p>3. Should the reported quality of homecare not be a performance indicator as well as the uptake of direct payments? Without it being monitored, it seems that there's a focus on promoting independence over ensuring high quality care.</p>	<p>focused on the impact we make rather than the outputs we produce. This move towards an outcome focused set of strategic performance indicators has continued and the 2019/20 to 2021/22 Strategic Plan is underpinned by a fully revised set of indicators. The council measures and collects hundreds of indicators and Cabinet determines the indicators most suitable to measuring impact at strategic level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home care providers are quality assured and regulated by the Care Quality Commission (CQC). In addition the council monitors the providers it commissions. Although the 'reported quality of homecare' is not included in the Council's Quarterly Performance & Improvement Monitoring Report, there is a thorough process of homecare quality monitoring in place in Tower Hamlets, drawing on a range of sources. We have a Quality Monitoring Team that monitors the performance of all providers, including visits to providers and provider forums where they can meet health and social care professionals and other professionals to discuss key issues relating to quality. In 2018/19 the team visited 1,294 service users, and 96.5% were satisfied with the personal care provided. The team also monitors the user satisfaction surveys that providers undertake. In addition the team liaise regularly with health and social care
---	---

<p>4. Comments around the continued use of agency social workers point to more staff than anticipated being needed following increased caseloads after the introduction of the early help service. Is this likely to resolve itself in time as the introduction of early help means that there'll be fewer serious cases coming through and the social work academy will lead to a more stable permanent workforce? When is this issue expected to be solved?</p>	<p>colleagues on individual cases on safeguarding and quality of care. The team is also in close contact with CQC who regulate providers and provide them with a 'rating'. Of the 11 homecare providers commissioned by the Council, 1 is rated as 'Outstanding' (9%), 5 are rated as 'Good' (45%), 4 are rated as 'Requiring Improvement' (36%) and 1 has yet to be rated (9%).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of agency staff is monitored monthly as part of the Children's Services Improvement Group. Our new social work academy is starting to have an impact on the level of agency staff. For further detail please refer to the latest quarterly update report on Children's Services improvement as presented to Cabinet in March 2019.
<p>I understand we are trying to do what we can to improve our ratings in certain children service areas from our minimum set targets to the aspirational targets. But I have a few questions and suggestions as examples to give below. There are a lot of ambers and reds that need to be constantly monitored and tackled.</p> <p>M1.2 What actions will be taken and who is doing this?</p> <p>Young Work Path is already working with New City College, South Quay College and schools and delivering a full programme of information, advice and guidance and employability programmes. The service is also developing a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All children's services indicators are subject to monthly reporting and review at the relevant Divisional and Directorate management teams. Children's Social care indicators are also subject to additional monitoring and intervention through the Children's Services Improvement Board, chaired by our external improvement advisor. • M1.2: Young Workpath works through a wide variety of channels and partners to work with young people who are NEET. The service now has a presence in schools on results day, where they are able to

<p>new range of careers events and information sharing across digital channels including a virtual careers service. We will be undertaking research to identify the aspirations of school leavers and we will use this information to shape additional support interventions.</p> <p>1) Have we thought about involving other institutions such as youth hubs to reach out to some of the more hard to reach young people from early on?</p> <p>M1.1 Pupils and attendance</p> <p>What actions will be taken?</p> <p>The Attendance and Welfare Service continue to provide support to improve school attendance and maintaining high attendance rates is a continuing focus for schools.</p> <p>Who is doing this?</p> <p>The Attendance and Welfare Service and schools will continue to work on reaching this performance target.</p> <p>1) What kind of support is being provided to ensure we reach our ambitious target?</p> <p>2) There's a trend in how the percentages change for each month in 2017 and 2018? Are there any particular reasons for this pattern?</p>	<p>provide advice and guidance to young people at greater risk of being NEET at the point of transition. This means they are able to build a relationship at a critical point in the young person's education and employment journey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M1.1: Our aim is to maintain performance at a high level as is currently the case. Details of the support provided by the Attendance and Welfare Service can be found here. It should be noted that absence is reported as a rolling figure for the academic year to date. Officers have not explored the reasons in detail but it is notable that seasonality, with higher levels of absence, appears to be a pattern. Levels of attendance are higher in the early and late parts of the academic year, nearest the summer. Attendance is lower in the colder part of the year.
<p>No narrative is given when we have met or exceeded targets. We are thereby missing out on useful analysis. Were targets too unambitious? Are there reasons we have performed which we need to understand in order to disseminate best practice? Are we overspending in areas of overachievement? Some of the actions to be taken are very vague, or simply say "we'll carry on doing what we've been doing" which suggests either that there is no motivation</p>	<p>The corporate quarterly performance report provides a high level overview of performance against the strategic outcomes. Reporting of performance indicators is by exception, The report is one element of a wider performance management framework operating at all tiers of</p>

<p>to actually perform or, which may be more likely, that the targets are not realistic. An example of a helpful analysis of this sort of issue is in M4.3.</p> <p>Where targets not met, the reasons given are often not actually reasons, and the ‘when it will be met’ is in many cases not actually a firm date, but an assurance of ‘monitoring’.</p> <p>Specific</p> <p>M1.3 - businesses supported We wouldn’t give a grant to an organisation that used an output like this. We need to measure the effectiveness/impact of the support, rather than that it was given</p>	<p>the organisation, from individuals through to organisational strategic performance. More detailed questions and interrogation of performance data, both on and off target, takes place at the most appropriate level in the organisation.</p> <p>Alongside the transition to an outcome focused performance framework, we are also developing a more refined and balanced approach to target setting, which takes into consideration ambition, value for money, and impact of investment. This will be mirrored by an outcome based approach to budgeting.</p> <p>M1.3 – Cabinet adopted a revised set of strategic performance indicators in April as part of the updated Strategic Plan. The revised set of performance indicators focuses on outcomes and in line with the council’s Growth Plan, a revised measure on new business creation following business support has been included.</p>
<p>Item: 6.6 Revenue and Capital Budget Outturn 2018/19</p>	
<p>Questions</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>1. During the presentation of the report to OSC on the 20th it was mentioned that there is a worry on “Rates” collection in the formula proposed; which will see less revenue coming in – in the future; please can you kindly elaborate and pounds or ratio what is the expected deficit for 19/20, 20/21 and 21/22?</p>	<p>Apologies if there was a lack of clarity; the concern over business rates expressed was in relation to the business rate reset scheduled to take place in 2020/21. As LBTH is an area that has seen significant growth since the baseline was set, a resetting of the baseline (which would build that growth into a new base) would be a significant issue to manage alongside the other changes mentioned – The Spending Review and the Fair</p>

	<p>Funding review. At this stage the impact cannot be quantified as the methodology that will be used has not been agreed by the government; hence all of the concerns referred to are in relation to the continued uncertainty.</p>
<p>2. Under “Sale of General Funds” Capital Budget, on page 297 of the report there is a reference to “Atlee House, deed of release”; please can you kindly provide full explanation as to what this is? What has been released, how and why? And if this is a continuous income or one of?</p>	<p>The capital receipt is a one-off sum. The Council own the freehold of the property of which the long leasehold is held by Toynbee Hall. A joint planning application on the land by Toynbee Hall and London Square Ltd was granted for redevelopment of the site. There are restrictive covenants attached to the property, and legal advice was provided that these would be binding on the leaseholder, therefore a premium was negotiated in order to lift this restriction in order to allow the development to proceed. The agreed premium was £250k.</p>
<p>3. If the Council has underspend £1.2M in education fund; why are they taking away the vital school administrative/clerical service? Why can't the underspend amount allocated to these Services to continue?</p>	<p>The underspend in the Schools Block of the DSG can only be used for expenditure by schools or on pupil provision (largely the delegated formula funding). The underspend arose as explained mainly as the pupil growth projections for additional classes in new and expanding schools did not materialise. I'm unsure exactly what service is being referred to – on the assumption that it is a service provided centrally by the Council the Schools Block of the DSG cannot, under legislative provision, be used for that purpose.</p>
<p>Item: 6.7 Approval of Change to Servelec contract</p>	

Questions	Response
<p>I completely understand the need for this contract and think it's vital we take the necessary steps to avoid any delays in light of our visits and recommendations made by Ofsted in the monitoring visits. But I do have a few questions/comments relating to the decision as tabled below.</p> <p>ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS 2.1/2.2:</p> <p>1) How much would this framework cost? How high is the risk of delay and estimated for how long?</p> <p>3.8:</p> <p>1) How long is this expected to take as there will be some delay in migrating? 2) How are we making up for the delay in the process of things?</p> <p>6.1/6.2:</p> <p>1) Any thoughts or suggestion on how funding can be more sustainable? 2) What are we already doing to find SFS?</p>	<p>Further advice indicates Cabinet approval is required regardless of whether or not we use a framework so we have not pursued further details of cost or timescale.</p> <p>Frameworks typically levy a charge of around 2% to 5%. For commodity products competition between many suppliers and economies of scale from buying as part of the whole public sector tend to outweigh any fee. For specialist services the benefit of frameworks is more convenience.</p> <p>As the CCS DAS framework we considered using is relatively new and we have not used it previously, Legal would need to review the terms and conditions, estimated at four weeks depending on competing demands. We have since learnt the supplier is renegotiating their terms with the CCS DAS framework and so presents a moving target it is impossible to put a timeframe on.</p> <p>Overall delivery of Phase 1 of Mosaic is now scheduled for completion in April 2020; this includes extensive reworking of workflows once the migration and re-hosting is complete.</p> <p>The project plan contains contingency. The main determinant of progress in the later phases of the project is the availability of social work subject matter experts to determine the configuration of Mosaic.</p> <p>Once the anticipated Ofsted inspection is announced we will update the project plan</p>

	<p>accordingly.</p> <p>The IT Future Sourcing project is reviewing how IT support services are provided and funded within existing budgets once the Agilisys contract ends in 2021. The working group is made up of representatives from IT, Finance, HR, Procurement and Legal.</p>
--	--