

**Mid & West Wales
Supporting People Programme
Regional Collaborative Committee**

**Thursday, 7th March 2019, 10:00am
The Plough Inn, Rhosmaen, Llandeilo SA19 6NP**

Present:

RCC Members:

Cllr. Jane Tremlett (Chair)

Cllr Alun Williams

Dr Gareth Morgan (GM)

Gaynor Toft

David Harries (DH)

Rachael Eagles (Vice Chair)

David Tovey (DT)

Guy Evans (GE)

Ian Randell (IR)

Angharad Rogers (AR)

Claire McDonald (CMcD)

Liz Cook (LC)

Carmarthenshire County Council (CC)

Ceredigion CC

Hywel Dda University Health Board

Ceredigion CC

OPCC

Providers and Landlords Rep

Providers and Landlords Rep

Providers and Landlords Rep

Pembrokeshire CC

Welsh Government

Welsh Government

Welsh Government

RCC Advisors:

Alun Jones (AJ)

Gary Proven (GP)

Adrian Jones (AdJ)

Anna Henchie (AH)

Joy James

Carmarthenshire CC

Ceredigion CC

Powys CC

Ceredigion CC

Pembrokeshire CC

RDC

Beverly B Davies (BD)

Regional Development Coordinator

Apologies:

Cllr Pat Davies

Emily James

Louise Webster

Christine Harley

Sue Thomas

Chris Harrison

Jonathan Morgan

Jason Smith

Caroline Davies

Pembrokeshire CC

Pembrokeshire CC

Landlords Representative

Probation

Ceredigion CC

Carmarthenshire and Pembrokeshire CC

Carmarthenshire CC

Providers Representative

Landlords Representative

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies	<p>Chair welcomed everybody. All made their self-introductions. BD cited apologies.</p>	<p>Chair All BD</p>
2. WG Update CCG and Flexible Funding Alignment	<p>WG Team has been out to various events and talking to different groups and many people in the room may have heard about Funding Flexibility. In context, the Welsh Ministers made a decision to have two grants – HSG and CCG. It means that a team now looks at the similarities between the two grants and how the programmes can work together.</p> <p>For HSG, there is one Minister and three grants. For CCG, there are four Ministers and seven grants meaning it has more chains than the other. WG provides strategic direction but wants to shape the grants in a co-production way with LAs.</p> <p>Where are we in this process? Where are we planning to go?</p> <p>Children and Community Grant (CCG) On the CCG side, seven programmes, which are different from each other, are now being brought together. Currently, programmes operate as they are. There will be conversation with ministers around whether to rebrand the group, have a complete set of guidance, and start from a blank sheet of paper. It was recognised that it is hard to let go of flagship programmes and policies like Flying Start and Families First.</p> <p>2019/20 is a transition year and both grants are trying to understand what can be done and what can't be done with the limitations at hand.</p> <p>CMcD advised the Committee that when commissioning, LAs should start thinking about joint commissioning. By 2021, this conversation should be happening. In other local authorities (i.e. Conwy, Newport, and Cardiff), conversations around this are already taking place. Big learning from Pathfinders was that <u>it is good to have someone from within the local authority who can drive this change forward</u>. In Carmarthenshire there is already a structure that helps this conversation. Different LAs have different challenges and WG is happy to have conversations with individual authority to address this.</p> <p>In comparison to HSG, CCG has a different way of asking information from stakeholders. LAs were asked to produce</p>	<p>CMcD</p>

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
HSG Update	<p>CCG delivery plans.</p> <p>WG is also working on a unified outcomes framework. The document has been recently circulated and shows the intention of how the framework is developed. There are expectations that the framework will change how we work.</p> <p>There will be two grants until the end of the assembly term and it is not sure whether in the future grants will be put in the RSG, will be one super grant, etc. What WG can do now is to make sure that they work efficiently internally; and LAs are expected to do the same.</p> <p>Housing Support Grant (HSG) From April 2019, HSG will come into place. It will be implemented in two stages - 2019/20 is a transition year, business as usual and will continue to work towards three separate guidance. For example, SP Guidance which was updated in 2018, will be applied next year. Final integrated HSG Guidance will be implemented by April 2020. Supplementary Guidance was issued in January 2019. One change for SP: Outcomes will still be collected in 2019/20 but will not be submitted to WG.</p> <p>Since December 2018, WG has been engaging with stakeholders across the board and the process is coming to an end. Over the next months, WG will be collating all the feedback and bring proposals together. Over the summer (June – July) proposals will be tested with stakeholders. Draft of Guidance will be ready for consultation by autumn.</p> <p>Alongside these activities, there are two separate workstreams going on – (1) learning disability (LD) lead by Liz Cook, and (2) funding distribution lead by Karl Thomas. Findings from these two projects will inform Ministers’ decision in autumn 2019.</p> <p>AH queried on the approach funding distribution is taking.</p> <p>AR clarified that the consultation on funding distribution is around HSG. The project was a result of recent WAO review. Karl Thomas is leading on the project and will be going out to local authorities to gather information. It is hoped that the project will form an evidence for Ministers by November 2019.</p> <p>AH stated that it may be difficult to joint commission if there are potential changes in funding in the near future. AR</p>	AR

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
<p>Learning Disability Services in the context of HSG</p>	<p>confirmed that, should there be changes in the funding formula, there will be a transition period to allow planning for changes in services.</p> <p>Questions were raised around CCG+HSG Delivery Plan. Should it respond to corporate strategies? Should LA's respond to the Grants objectives? CMcD said that there is no model for LAs on how HSG and CCG can be delivered together. What matters for now is that there are conversations taking place between programmes so that LAs work efficiently and avoid duplications of services. Some LAs involve people from finance which may limit strategic conversations. This was not encouraged.</p> <p>CMcD is willing to work with LAs to see how to progress on this.</p> <p>Action CMcD to send Wavehill report which outlines the recommendations for LAs towards efficient flexible funding.</p> <p>GE raised the question whether there is a threat to regional commissioning under this transition. It is observed that LAs, having different corporate agendas, work in silos and respond to flexible funding in different ways.</p> <p>There is a risk to regional working at least in CCG as one programme is regionally based and the other 6 operate at local levels. For HSG, there is no decision made in terms of future regional working and the RCC going forward but there is a strong message from engagement events that stakeholders want to keep the regional working element. Whether it will be in a form of RCC or another structure is yet to be decided. It is not sure how this will work and what will be the funding around look like.</p> <p>Learning Disability LC leads on the LD workstream under HSG. Background of this project goes back to the WAO report in 2017 where there were concerns around housing related support for people with LD, primarily on eligibility, and also on how it is funded by different local authorities and how services are delivered.</p> <p>WG accepted the recommendations from WAO but following the decision on two grants last October, it was agreed to review its funding. The main question WG aims to answer is - In the light of HSG, should the housing related support services continue to be funded by HSG</p>	<p>CMcD</p> <p>LC</p>

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
Outcomes Framework	<p>or should it be transferred across to Social Services?</p> <p>LC is now gathering evidence to inform the advice for Welsh Ministers in autumn along with consultations around funding distribution.</p> <p>Two ways of gathering evidence: commissioned research and stakeholder engagement. LC's attendance to the RCC is part of the engagement activity.</p> <p>LC asked the RCC of what they think of the question.</p> <p>DT advised LC that there are disability forums in local authorities which can be a good opportunity for WG to engage with. In SP forums there are few LD providers so might be difficult to get wider views.</p> <p>Action All to let LC know of any LD sessions in local authorities. LC will try to get involved.</p>	All
	<p>AdJ stated that many people with LD often live in isolation and in supported living. SP provides light into it. In Powys, SP fills the financial gap and social services relies on SP. SP funding in LD is very large.</p> <p>Action LC to collate all feedback from today's meeting and send summary to the Committee.</p>	LC
	<p>LC welcomed all to contact her for any question or additional feedback on the topic for a one to one conversation.</p> <p>On Outcomes Framework WG has now an intention to develop a strategy for both HSG and CCG. Currently, 10 areas have different requirements in terms of data.</p> <p>Flexible Funding team is looking to form a data group. CMcD invited the Committee to take part or send someone analytical from LAs who may be able to help inform and develop the outcomes framework. The Framework will be consulted on. There will be discussions with ministers around this.</p>	CMcD
	<p>Full framework will be consulted on and happy to come back to the RCC for discussion and feedback.</p> <p>Action CMcD to present full framework to the RCC either in September or December RCC meeting.</p>	CMcD

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
	<p>BD asked the Committee about Mid and West representation to the Data Group. How to make sure LAs are linked to the group and able to shape the framework? Should we send reps from the region or from each LAs? How to make sure we communicate this with CCG in each LA? In other LAs/regions, SP commissioners who deal with outcomes are involved in data group.</p> <p>AH highlighted that different LAs collect data differently and one person for the region may not be able to capture or hold information for all LAs. This was supported by AJ as although they are working on the same template different counties have different ways of working. But, sending two per LA - one for CCG and one HSG, means 8 from the region which is a large number.</p> <p>AR advised the Committee that it is not yet clear how FF team will run the data group. It would make sense for the Committee to forward names. WG/FF team may decide and advise to have a tight group but LAs in Mid and West should be linked in.</p> <p>LAs to look at appropriate persons within their areas to be part of Outcomes Data Group and send names to FF Team.</p>	<p>LA Reps</p>
<p>3. Minutes of the Last Meeting & Matters Arising</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>The Minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and agreed to be accurate.</p> <p>On Action 6</p> <p>CH met with the steering group, which consists of SP team leads and GM, to discuss the mechanism /flowchart for regional commissioning and/or RCC off-the-shelf funding. Meeting was on 5th February 2019. Draft of flowchart/mechanism will be presented to the RCC when ready.</p> <p>In terms of ToR, RCC can review the ToR once the RCC gets more clarity on how HSG will look like in the future.</p> <p>BD carried out a mapping exercise on how RCC is linked with landlords and providers in the region. The mapping exercise was presented to the RCC Chair. Chair highlighted the gaps in the communication links between RCC and providers forums/landlords and this could be discussed in the next RCC meeting.</p> <p>Agenda in the next meeting the communication links</p>	<p>All</p> <p>BD</p>

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
	<p>between RCC and providers/landlords.</p> <p>Chair asked the Committee whether circulation of RCC Agenda and Minutes within 2-3 weeks after RCC meeting was useful. Providers/landlords found this useful.</p>	
<p>4. Declaration of Interest</p>	<p>No declaration of interests made</p>	<p>All</p>
<p>5. RCC Priority Four – ‘Service User’ Involvement</p> <p>Review of RCC SU Involvement Framework</p> <p>Action</p>	<p> Paper 5a RCC ‘Service User’ Involvement</p> <p>Presentation available above.</p> <p>BD informed the RCC that there is a regional strategy framework being developed by West Wales Partnership Board and Public Health Wales. RDC attended the workshop on the 6th March to link RCC in the regional partnership which presents an opportunity to align SP/RCC engagement activities with the regional engagement framework.</p> <p>Draft of framework will be available end of March.</p> <p>BD to circulate to RCC draft of regional engagement framework for information.</p> <p>RCC agreed to formally involve in the regional partnership. BD asked the Committee on who else to send to the working group to ensure continuous engagement. RCC may advise on who else to send to the working group once they see the draft of the framework.</p> <p>In terms of RCC SU Involvement Framework, BD highlighted the requirement for RCCs to put in place a working framework as identified in SP Practice Guidance 2018. BD presented the following: Role of the RCC, local authorities, and providers in SU’s engagement; RCC existing framework which was developed in 2014; RCC’s attempt to have an engagement group in 2016; and ToR for the engagement group in 2016.</p> <p>Existing SUI Framework is well-evidenced and provides wealth of information.</p> <p>BD also carried out review of engagement practices in the region through local providers’ forums, face-to-face interviews with commissioners and providers, and survey forms.</p> <p>BD recommended that the RCC have a sub-group or a steering group to put information together and</p>	<p>RDC</p> <p>BD</p>

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
	<p>redesign/restructure the RCC Working SU Involvement Framework; this time the group will involve people who use SP services, senior RCC members, and interested commissioners. It also offers opportunity for SUs to be involved in the RCC at board level.</p> <p>AR stated that from the recent HSG engagement with stakeholders, involving SUs came out strongly. The new guidance has a strong push in including SUs in all aspects of SP activities including staff recruitment. SU Involvement may remain a strong aspect of the new HSG Guidance, therefore, the suggestion of having a sub-group will be a very good one. Also, SU representation in the RCC can be in the form of a champion rather than a person receiving support services.</p> <p>BD reiterated that there are challenges in having SUs as representatives at the RCC due to the wide spectrum of SP client categories/needs and geographical nature of the region. There may be other ways to ensure SUs voice are heard in the RCC. For example, there may be a regional group for people with similar experiences and needs, i.e. VAWDSV survivors.</p> <p>RE informed the Committee that she is leading the VAWDSV workstream on engagement and currently developing a framework and keen to link works together because both boards are looking at the same group of people. Both boards should make sure that we look at existing structures and make the best use of them and not duplicating work.</p> <p>Whilst transportation is a common problem in involving people, engagement should be looked at differently and not just about bringing people together.</p> <p>AdJ highlighted that engagement strategies by big corporations are about understanding people and there are two main things we should be aiming to understand; one, what matters to them and how do they want to be supported; two – what are their experiences? So how we design our engagement activities should reflect what matters to individuals. We should be able to pick up trends and patterns on people’s experiences.</p> <p>Cllr. AW raised question around capturing individual needs in a regional level because people operate in much operational level. When designing the framework, do we need to think at local authority level or even beneath that to</p>	

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
<p>Action</p>	<p>truly engage? This way, SUs are truly represented. It is important that SU representative should be well connected to their grassroots. It is important that in this modern world, we engage in many different platforms, i.e. on paper, social media, face-to-face, workshops, etc to cover all groups and needs. Do we include unpaid carers in our engagement?</p> <p>Cllr. JT appreciated ideas brought to the table. There is not one way to do engagement and the framework should cover the whole spectrum asking fundamental questions.</p> <p>AH queried whether we reframe our SP framework or shall we tie this in with the current development of regional engagement framework and avoid duplication of work?</p> <p>Cllr. JT advised the group to take this thoughts away and come back with suggestions in the next couple of weeks.</p> <p>AH highlighted that if the regional framework is high level where we can link our work, it may be important that we do two things at the same time.</p> <p>BD to share with RCC the minutes of previous regional engagement meeting and the draft framework by end of March. This may help the Committee advice on how we reframe/review the RCC framework and link this to the regional partnership engagement framework.</p> <p>GE highlighted that the nature of SP involves commissioning and tendering which are competitive in nature. In some cases, providers have control over who may participate in engagement which may put the organisation in a good light. The framework should consider making the process easy and honest and encourage SUs to voluntarily engage and not pushed by providers/support workers. Feedbacks that are cherry-picked are not meaningful.</p> <p>There are challenges around this issue as some people needing support are not able to articulate what they want. Some do not want to give negative feedback. In health, for example, people may be weary in giving negative feedback or make complaints because they may be worried that their comments may affect their treatment.</p> <p>When collecting outcomes, there are narratives involved and we should be able to capture it. There is a wealth of evidence we can pull together to truly understand what people want. These information are easily collectible.</p>	<p>BD</p>

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
<p>Update on Regional SU Event/RCC Bulletin and use of social media</p>	<p>The Chair concurred that we should be able to get a pattern from multiple narratives. GM concurred that this means we will not be doing separate activity and collecting separate data as long as we get a good volume of narratives of experiences.</p> <p>RE informed the Committee that VAWDSV is working on its engagement framework and welcomes representations from SP. She has already received nominations from SUs and providers but none from local authorities as yet. Representations will be presented to VAWDSV Board next week.</p> <p>There was a regional SU event in January. It was attended by 20 SUs. BD presented the draft of RCC Bulletin. Bulletin is bilingual and is aimed to feedback to SUs. BD raised few concerns before bulletin is circulated – one, decision to form an engagement sub-group as this is advertised in the bulletin; two, is it better to have the bulletin or a section of bulletin in easy-read format?</p> <p>One theme that emerged from the SU event was that people wish they knew about house-related support services before they end up ‘sofa-surfing’ or sleeping rough.</p> <p>BD explored options to promote SP services.</p> <p>RE suggested to rethink about the presentation of the bulletin because people on the ground may not know about RCC or SP, rather use existing vehicles to access those people and in a way that information is accessible, understandable and meaningful.</p> <p>Cllr AW concurred that RCC should use existing communication vehicles but vehicles are uneven. For example, the use of social media. In Ceredigion use of social media is currently not proactive and reactive. Also in responding to feedback, the council may not be the right people to respond.</p> <p>What matters is that we use as many platforms as we can to reach the wide spectrum of people that use our services. DT highlighted that providers and partner organisations and information from SP/RCC can be shared through existing platforms.</p> <p>It was concluded that RCC needs a framework that maps</p>	

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
	<p>out the matrix of information sharing and identifies ways of engagement.</p> <p>GE suggested that providers are the road to market and we should utilise them. This can be discussed in providers' forums.</p> <p>AR mentioned that Welsh Government mailbox do receive a lot of queries bout SP; this may be because people do not know where to access information. WG do redirect people to local authorities.</p> <p>IR suggested that whilst promoting SP services is a good idea, consideration should be made so that we do not promote SP in isolation. There are platforms like community connectors and DEWIS that hold information on wide variety of services. A question was raised about how this can be done.</p> <p>Cllr. JT concluded that clearly we need to have good grip on the matter and to have a subgroup to unpick the pros and cons of different ways of engagement. Interested parties were invited get involved in the engagement subgroup and put their names forward.</p> <p>Action BD to send out invitation for the RCC engagement subgroup.</p> <p><i>Coffee Break</i></p>	BD
<p>6. Providers and Landlords Updates</p>	<p>In Ceredigion, the recent providers' forum was constructive. There was a feeling that providers would like to be more engaged and drive the agenda. There is an intention that local forum will include homelessness in future meetings.</p> <p>Providers in forums are not very vocal and hoped this changes moving forward.</p>	<p>Providers/Landlords</p>
<p>7. Financial and Local Planning Update</p>	<p>Ceredigion – Commissioning and spend plans are in. Clarity on integrated working between HSG and CCG from the start could have a good start. There seems to have a lot of pressure on Flying Start, Families First and other programmes in CCG and that means they sit together and get things done. It was felt that HSG is becoming an addition rather an equal partner to CCG.</p> <p>Pembrokeshire – Plans for 2019/20 are in and currently doing the commissioning exercise. There is now a Children and Community Board which includes SP. The Board meets monthly.</p>	<p>SP Leads</p>

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
<p>Brexit and potential implications to SP services</p>	<p>AH stated that the way CCG is working means they have the branding and identity right from the beginning and this means they get more buy-in from corporate management. Their plan needs to be signed off corporately and therefore gets more support from the corporate management.</p> <p>Carmarthenshire – Plans are in and waiting for any feedback and for the final grant letter from WG. There is more clarity around how funding will look like and how SP will work for the next financial year. In terms of HSG and CCG, people from two grants meet regularly. The group now looks at services where there are crossovers and where services can be joined up in the future.</p> <p>Powys – Tendering exercise is done. Plan includes extended locality support, mental health, DA, and youth services. Homelessness strategy is quite strong on supporting young people and SP will contribute to that agenda. SP team is also spending on local libraries as it is seen there is an increasing demand for libraries as a neutral space for locality support but there is still a question on how much SP can spend on this. LD is about to go out for tender.</p> <p>Cllr. AW updated the group on Brexit and potential implications to services.</p> <p>WG and WLGA have been assessing potential impact of a ‘no deal’ Brexit scenario on social services. There was national audit of staff in social services. 17.7% of social services workers in Wales are EU nationals but this varies from region to region and from sector to sector. There is an assumption that EU workers with no criminal record can stay and will need to go through a process. There are risks for some vulnerable people who lack the knowledge and ability to apply for settled status. LAs need to ensure that no one slips the net and miss out on support.</p> <p>In the event of a no-deal, there is likely to be shortage in supplies like fuel, etc. This will have impact on support workers not being able to drive around and this will have knock on effect to people and other services. In terms of medication, Hywel-Dda is stocking about 25% above normal. Concerns are on non-medical supplies. There will be no shortage in general food but potential shortage in fruits and vegetables. Arguably, food prices are likely to rise in the region of 20%. All these will have potential</p>	<p>Cllr. AW</p>

ITEM	MINUTES/ACTIONS	LEAD
	compounded effects which are very hard to predict. How do SP/providers prepare for a no-deal Brexit?	
<p>8. RDC Update</p> <p>RCC Work Plan Progress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WG Submissions/Schedule of Returns as set out in the SP Guidance 2018 • Regional Strategic Plan – submitted on 31st January 2019 • Summary of RSP was developed will be available online • Regional Spend Plan – Submitted on 4th February 2019 • Outcomes Report, Period 2 2018 – Submitted by LAs on 28 February • RCC Annual Report – due on June 2019 • Final Grant Offer Letter to Local Authorities - End of March 2019, when WG is content of LAs SP Spend Plans and Homelessness Prevention Delivery Plan <p>BD asked the Committee on how the WorkPlan can be progressed more effectively in the future and make people more accountable? Should we have a workstream for each priority themes? Should we agenda update on workplan in every meeting?</p> <p>BD reported progress of RCC Work Plan.</p>	BD
<p>9. AOB</p> <p>Action</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>RCC Annual Report 2018/19 will be submitted to WG in June 2019. BD requested to review RCC in April to get a fresh look of the financial year.</p> <p>Draft of the RCC Annual Review will be ready for presentation in June Meeting for the Committee to feedback on.</p> <p>Previous Annual Review had a positive feedback from SPNAB. It brought some positive changes to RCC working.</p> <p>BD to circulate questionnaire to all.</p>	<p>BD</p> <p>BD</p>
<p>10. Dates of future meeting/Themes</p>	<p>Thursday 13th June, 10:00 – 12:30 Thursday 12th September, 10:00 – 12:30 Thursday 12th December, 10:00 – 14:00 Thursday 12th March 2020, 10:00 – 12:30</p>	All

Prepared by: BD