

CAMBRIDGESHIRE LIFELINE PROJECT BUSINESS CASE

To: **Adults Committee**

Meeting Date: **12 March 2020**

From: **Charlotte Black: Service Director: Adults & Safeguarding**

Electoral division(s): **All**

Forward Plan ref: **2020/028** *Key decision:* **Yes**

Purpose: **The Committee is being asked to approve the business case for Cambridgeshire's Technology Enabled Care Service to become a Lifeline provider that includes a tender for an Alarm Receiving Centre for a four year contract.**

Recommendation:

- a) The Committee is asked to support option 2 for the charging method (section 0 and 3.2.4).**
- b) The Committee is asked to support the recommended charge to customers of £5 per week for the Lifeline service (section 3.4.4 and 3.6.3).**
- c) The Committee is asked to endorse a bid to the General Purposes Committee for £172,406 of Transformation funding.**

<i>Officer contact:</i>		<i>Member contact:</i>	
Name:	Jane Crawford-White	Names:	Cllr Anna Bailey
Post:	Service Development – TEC	Post:	Chair
Email:	Jane.Crawford-White@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	Anna.bailey@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 373270	TEL:	01223 706398

1. AIM

- 1.1 The aim of this project is to produce a viable business case for Cambridgeshire Technology Enabled Care (TEC) to become a Lifeline provider so that the income from the charges to customers funds the provision of the Lifeline service.
- 1.2 TEC is a key and integral service that is part of the Prevention and Early Intervention Services for adult social care. Increasing the uptake of TEC is a core part of the Adults Positive Challenge Programme. This proposal will enhance the ability of TEC to achieve their targets and is an essential step prior to further developments and opportunities.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The County Council will need to plan for the telephone digital switch over in 2023 – 2025 and how it impacts on all the customers who have connected telecare. In Cambridgeshire this is currently estimated to be between 12,000 and 15,000 people who live in sheltered accommodation and people who have a Lifeline in their own home. This group of people will be the most affected by the digital switchover because they rely on land line connections and the Alarm Receiving Centres (ARC) are slow to upgrade to fully digital platforms. This project will make a significant contribution to preparing for the switch over for those people with dispersed alarms. The Housing Providers will remain responsible for the preparation for the digital switchover for people living in sheltered accommodation.
- 2.2 The business case is that the TEC service becomes a Lifeline provider in addition to maintaining their current responsibilities. The team would increase to include two installers to fit the Lifeline, peripherals and keysafe in one visit. There would also be an increase in business support to complete managing the referral, loading the recording onto Mosaic and finance systems, completing reviews and liaising with the Alarm Receiving Centre (ARC). A competitive tender process will need to be completed to secure a 4 year contract for the ARC. The ARC will provide the 24/7 monitoring of the Lifeline activations and instigating a response from family, Enhanced Response Service or emergency service.
- 2.3 It is noted that Transformation Funding of up to £39k was approved in April 2019 for this discovery phase of the project (including input from subject matter expertise (SME)), which has resulted in this business case with next steps for successful implementation. This report was approved at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Commissioning Board in January 2020.

3. MAIN ISSUES

3.1 Rationale for Cambs TEC wanting to become a Lifeline provider.

- 3.1.1 Currently the TEC service does not issue Lifelines but has a dependency on a large number of different Lifeline providers. In Cambs all Lifeline holders are being charged by their Lifeline providers. The main Lifeline providers in Cambridgeshire are:

- Cambridge City Council
- South Cambs District Council
- Chorus operating mainly in Huntingdonshire
- Sanctuary operating mainly in East Cambs

- Circle operating mainly in Fenland
- Cross Keys Homes operating mainly in norths Cambs. Cross Keys Homes also provides Lifelines for 6 week funded by Cambs TEC primarily to support rapid hospital discharges
- Kings Lynn Careline operating mainly in Fenland

There are a number of other Lifeline providers that have fewer connections in Cambridgeshire including Age UK and Appello.

3.1.2 There are a number of issues associated with this complex system of providers leading to the following rationale for this project:

- Complexity for the TEC service interacting with a minimum of six different Lifeline providers and six different Alarm Receiving Centres (ARC) – each with their own rates of charges, protocols and processes.
- Complexity for customers having to interact with two organisations, one for their Lifeline and Cambs TEC for their peripherals (sensors and detectors that connect to the Lifelines). For some of the providers above if the Customer requires a keysafe this is a third service they need to interact with.
- Complexity for professionals, needing to make two referrals to different organisations but ensure that provision is co-ordinated.
- Expectation that TEC is an important part of the Council's prevention/early intervention offering and an expectation to increase the numbers of people benefitting from TEC. Embedding TEC is a key work stream of the Adults Positive Challenge Programme.
- TEC does not have any direct access to histories of activations and it is a four step process to obtain this data. TEC contacts the Lifeline provider who then contacts the ARC for the report which is forwarded to the Lifeline provider and then on to TEC. The process is time consuming and delayed and does not support timely and preventative interventions.
- In the preparations for the Open Reach digital switchover 2023-5 the Council would have no direct management of the risks associated with the transition. The TEC service would be entirely reliant on the partners listed in 2.1 who could each take a different approach to the preparations thus running the risk of increasingly complex processes for the TEC service, and potential costs to the customer.

3.1.3 There are a number of risks to future CCC services that could arise if this business case does not gain CCC the approval to become a Lifeline provider:

- Inability to deliver future projects and proposals that are dependent on Cambs TEC being a Lifeline provider, such as deploying intelligent Lifelines enabling predictive activations and responses, ARC making outgoing calls. Both of these future projects would enhance the prevention and early intervention services, for example, the intelligent Lifelines can monitor activities of daily living and activations are generated when there is a deviation in routine such as mobilising less being an early warning of a possible fall or change in bathroom usage indicating a possible urine tract infection.
- No direct preparation and management of the digital switch over for telephones. If this business case is not approved an alternative plan would need to be made incurring cost without the benefit of any income. The plan would likely involve at the least having a technician visit people with a Lifeline either to remove the older types of Lifeline and install digital ones or to modify the newer style Lifelines. During the switch of Lifelines all the peripherals would need to be repaired and

tested with the ARC. If this is not done reliably the risk is the sensors do not send an activation when they should and a customer's need for help is missed.

- Limited ability to introduce new digital connected telecare equipment and test compatibility with the ARC. TEC needs to have a range of products to better meet the individual circumstances.
- Continuing dependency on other lifeline providers.
- Missed opportunity for securing income for this part of the TEC service.
- Ongoing complexity for TEC service and other professionals.
- Fewer people able to benefit from prevention and early interventions and the postponement of social care packages
- TEC already has high cost avoidance targets. The risk is the targets would not be met.
- Reputational damage and restriction of innovation as Cambridgeshire's TEC Team are nationally recognised as one of the most forward thinking in UK.

3.2 Cambridgeshire TEC proposal for charging for Lifelines

3.2.1 The proposal is there is a flat rate of charges for 24/7 telecare monitoring, installation, withdrawals and maintenance:

- Standard Lifeline for monitoring when the customer is in the house with any additional peripherals as needed
- Mobile monitoring with GPS positioning for outside the home e.g. Pebbell, Chiptec Go, True Kare

It is proposed that the ARC making outgoing calls should be developed after the Lifeline provision has been implemented successfully but that the specification for the ARC includes the possibility for implementing the outbound calling within the contract period.

Charges would exclude:

- Any charges for equipment, as per Care Act 2014, including no additional charges for monitoring extra peripherals
- Any charges for the mobile response service – Enhanced Response Service which is provided by CCC's Reablement Service

Cambs TEC have so far offered the first 6 weeks of Lifeline provision funded by the Council along with installation costs and fitting of a key safe. This has been very successful at increasing the numbers of people with TEC and reducing the barriers for customers for making the decision to have a Lifeline. Retention rate at 6 weeks is 75%. The majority of those not retaining is due to death, moving into residential care or into a family member's home.

3.2.3 There are two options for how the charging for Lifelines could be applied:

- **Option 1:** Charges would be at the flat rate applied for people who do not meet the criteria for social care services. For people who do meet the criteria and who have been assessed as being financially eligible for a social care package the cost of the Lifeline would be included in their care and support plan and form part of their personal budget or their direct payment. These people would be subject to means testing to assess their contribution as normal. A recent audit of the TEC caseload of 3,000 people showed that 72% do not have any other social care and 28% also have a care package.

- **Option 2:** Charges could be applied at the flat rate for all people irrespective of whether they had a care package or not. However for those on benefits and who are in receipt of a Council funded care package who undergo a financial assessment, the assessment will take into account their payment for a community alarm system as Disability Related Expenditure (DRE) as per The Care Act's Care and Support Statutory Guidance. The Guidance specifically states "Community Alarms" as a key example areas of DRE that must be considered as part of someone's financial assessment to determine their care charge.

3.2.4 The Project Group are recommending the second option. The provision of Lifelines is not a statutory social care provision. There is no specific guidance for social care on the charging for Lifelines, provision is generally a housing provider responsibility. People who are becoming frail and vulnerable will generally consider having a Lifeline as the first support service that is taken up often several years before care is needed. Therefore in the first couple of years of the Lifeline service the overwhelming majority of people will not be in receipt of care. This option is preferred for the reconfiguration of Mosaic to have one process for setting up of the advance quarterly billing cycles that is distinct and separate from the care billing cycles. The processes and resources needed for Finance Teams will be simpler and manageable within existing capacity.

This recommendation will not require any changes to the most recent Adult Social Care charging policy to accommodate this.

The understanding of the Project Group is that this would not require a consultation with the public because this is a new service and there are no existing customers who would be impacted. The charging would apply only to new customers to the Cambs TEC service who require a Lifeline to be installed, after the project has been implemented. No existing customers who have received the six weeks funded by the Council would be impacted as they are private customers of the Alarm Receiving Centre at the end of the six week period.

3.3 Differences in Lifeline Provision in Peterborough and Cambridgeshire

The main difference in the two Council's Lifeline provision is that Peterborough is a unitary authority with Housing Provider responsibility and has funded and provided Lifelines through a contract with Cross Keys Homes. These have been funded by the Council since 2015. The provision of Lifelines, peripherals and key safes has been done at a single visit. Historically no customers have been charged for Lifelines. However the implementation of charges for Lifelines in Peterborough is part of Peterborough City Council's (PCC) budget proposals.

Cambridgeshire has not been a Lifeline provider apart from a winter pressure initiative started in 2018 to simplify and speed hospital discharges where an initial 6 week period has been funded by the Council. There have been at least 6 main Lifeline providers and customers are experiencing two or three separate visits to have their Lifeline, peripherals and a key safe installed. Historically all customers have been charged for Lifelines and there are various rates of charges currently being operated. This is an opportunity to make the customer experience simpler and the process more efficient.

This proposal and business case development relates to Cambridgeshire only at this time. It does not prevent Peterborough joining at a later date if the Cambridgeshire implementation is successful. This would need to be taken through the PCC decision making process.

At the start of the Cambridgeshire Lifeline Project we made contact with all five District/City Councils to see if they wanted to work on a joint proposal. Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire (South Cambs) District Council's expressed an interest leading to nine months of joint work on gathering baseline information, creating a vision for a joint integrated service and completing initial costings. This was discussed with senior commissioners who recommended that Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) should ensure that this proposal was cost effective for CCC alone first. Cambridge City Council and South Cambs District Council both preferred to continue to provide and manage their alarms particularly in the sheltered schemes. However if in the future there were sufficient benefits for integrating the provision Cambs TEC would be willing to consider it.

3.4 Cost and Savings

3.4.1 The financial modelling for the business case is based on including the costs for:

- Two Scale 5 Assistive Technologist posts and one Scale 4 Business Support Officer position to be members of the TEC service
- Two leased vans and fuel for installers
- Purchase of Lifelines – The business case costs are based on the purchase of fully digital lifelines only in order to be prepared for the digital switchover. The fully digital Lifelines are unlikely to need an engineer visit at the point of switchover. The Lifelines purchased would connect either via internet protocol and mobile sim for backup or via mobile sim as primary connection if the home has no broadband. The purchase of the equipment is proposed through the ICES contract with NRS with its 80% credit model. The benefits of doing this are through using the NRS barcoding for traceability, management and maintenance of stock
- Estimated charges from the Alarm Monitoring Centre. A competitive tender would be run once the business case is approved. The estimated values of the contract are:

Year 1	£12,398
Year 2	£31,360
Year 3	£50,322
Year 4	£66,535
Total	£160,614
- Project and management overheads

3.4.2 The business case is based on income from the customers at flat rate per week. The business case cast costed five options, charges of £4.50, £4.75, £5.00, £5.25 and £5.50 per connection per week. Note, all options are a competitive estimate based on benchmarking data (see section 3.6 below). Based on current TEC activity levels the assumption is that 55 people a month retain their Lifeline at the 6 week review. TEC is installing an average of 72 Lifelines a month. The average period that people retain their Lifelines is 3.5 years so the income and expenditure has been calculated over a four year period.

- End of year 1 – 663 connections
- End of year 2 – 1326 connections
- End of year 3 – 1989 connections
- End of year 4 – 2652 connections

It is expected that the Lifeline equipment would be recycled and reissued.

The model also takes into account the annual saving CCC would make on NRS charges for installation of connected telecare, as this would be completed by the TEC team at the same time as they install the Lifeline (average annual saving of £80k). The charges for the 6 week Lifelines to the current provider would cease and be replaced by the new ARC Provider.

- 3.4.3 The following table sets out the net savings for years 1- 5, for each of the different chargeable rates from £4.50 to £5.50 per week. These charges all exclude VAT as the standard process is for Customers to complete a VAT exemption form. The table also sets out the Transformation Funding required and the return on Transformation funding:

Rates	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total Saving	T.F Required	Return on T.F
4.50	0	0	-39,518	-78,257	-6,528	124,303	203,938	0.61
4.75	0	0	-60,559	-85,589	-7,308	153,456	188,172	0.82
5.00	0	0	-81,599	-92,921	-8,088	182,608	172,406	1.06
5.25	0	0	102,640	-100,253	-8,868	211,761	156,641	1.35
5.50	0	0	123,680	-107,585	-9,648	240,913	134,796	1.79

- 3.4.4 **The Project Group recommendation is that the charge per connection is £5.00.** See Appendix 1 for detailed costs and assumptions. The table below shows the total income and total expenditure projected for five years based on a £5 weekly charge.

£5pw charge	Total Income	Total Costs + Equipment	Transformation Fund Required	Net Saving*
Y1	70,265	212,087	141,822	
Y2	245,050	275,634	30,584	
			172,406	
Y3	420,810	339,211		-81,599
Y4	567,450	392,930		-174,520
Y5	583,050	400,442		-182,608

* Note as per legislation pertaining to all local authorities, this saving is due to full cost recovery of the service, and will be used to reinvest in frontline services and provision/management of ongoing pressures.

- 3.4.5 Transformation funding of £172,406 is required at the start of the project to cover the overall expenditure until the service can completely cover its own costs. In year 3 the income from customers covers the cost of the service and makes a net saving of £81,599. In year 4 this rises to a net saving of £174,520. The net saving in year 5 of

£183k will then continue annually based on stable numbers of connections at a charge of £5p/w. The charge for the service will be kept under review to ensure costs continue to be covered, and the service will review opportunities to expand or deliver more efficiently, which may see a return on investment over the longer term.

- 3.4.6 Section 93 Local Government Act 2003 gives local authorities the power the charge for services that they have a power but not a duty to provide. The level of income is restricted to the amount it costs to provide the services. It is important for them not to make a profit. They are not constrained in how they calculate costs. They can include the full cost of all aspects of the service provision. To that end the model factors in staff time allocated to the project and their corporate allocation.

3.5 **Non-Financial Benefits of the proposal**

- 3.5.1 The provision of Lifelines, TEC and the Enhanced Response Service are often the first services provided from Adult Social Care. The meeting of irregular and on demand needs with these services is effective at postponing the requirement for regular long term social care. Looking at the activity of the Enhanced Response Service (ERS) in the 9 months since April 2019 ERS has responded to 4,366 calls where there was no family member to respond. They have attended 1,668 calls for a fall and provided 1,170 people with personal care that is not part of a regular care package. This team has avoided 4,113 calls going to the Ambulance Service. Family members also respond to Lifeline activations that in reality make the greatest contribution to avoiding and postponing the need for health and social care. Lifeline provision enables people to continue living in their own home for as long as possible and at the same time gives family members peace of mind that their relative can summon assistance whenever it is needed day or night.
- 3.5.2 It is noted that overall cost avoidance attributed to the increased use of TEC in the county is forecast to be around £5.8m for 2019/20. Although the financial benefits costed for this project (section 3.4) clearly show the direct savings and surplus that could be achieved, as the Lifeline is one aspect of this overall TEC cost avoidance, there are indirect financial benefits to the council for undertaking this project that will simplify the whole process and hopefully increase use of TEC.
- 3.5.3 This project has a clear link to social and health benefits as well as the cost savings, further details of which are detailed below:
- Reduce the confusion and complexity for customers and their informal carers in which organisation is responsible for which piece of equipment and knowing who to contact when something goes wrong. For any customers with a Lifeline issued through TEC they would have just one point of contact for their Lifeline, their peripherals and their key safe.
 - Simplification of processes for the TEC team and for referring professionals in health, housing and social care. For the TEC team the simplification of processes is expected to release some capacity and reduce delays from dependency on other third party providers, which will be used to continue to increase the numbers of people benefitting from TEC and to continue to achieve cost avoidance targets.
 - Cambs TEC to be able to directly commission an Alarm Receiving Centre (ARC). As a part of this tender to be able to include additional functions such as monitoring of people outside their home with mobile technology, monitoring of intelligent Lifelines,

making outbound calls such as:

- Welfare checks for two weeks following discharge from hospital
 - Social engagement calls to address loneliness
 - Deal with medication alerts
 - Concierge services for people with no internet access or informal carer support to complete online shopping and other online services
 - Universal Public Health messaging of how to manage in hot weather/ cold weather, take up of flu jabs, falls prevention.
- It is noted that this will be a new service for which a new business case will need to be developed and will offer CCC an opportunity to enhance the Early Intervention and Prevention agenda.
 - Cambs TEC have direct access monitoring reports from ARC and are alerted early to frequent callers, thus enhancing the opportunities for prevention and early interventions. Having direct and immediate access to a customer's call history enables detection of changing trends, improvements or declines, and short intensive clusters of activations indicating an acute change of health or circumstances, which can be used to tailor services more effectively. The processes in Enhanced Response Service (ERS), TEC, prevention hub and Reablement will be updated during the implementation phase to make optimal use of the call history reports.
 - The ARC procured will need to use a digitally ready platform in preparation for the Open Reach digital switchover in 2023-5 and meeting TS50134-9 standards and has open application programming interfaces (APIs). These standards are required to future proof the service and support any potential for integrated information with health and social care records as well as transmission between the control panel in the person's home and the ARC. The Council would have direct management of the risks associated with the transition for the majority of their customers.
 - TEC would purchase digital Lifelines that would be reliable and robust during the digital switchover. These would not require technician visits to upgrade that would be inevitable if we did not implement this when all services move to digitalisation. They would not suffer from the trend of increasing snagging that analogue technology will present the closer to the switchover date.
 - TEC would have the ability and freedom to test and trial new Lifelines and other technologies in a fast developing market. Other technologies TEC would want to consider would include wearables, passive sensors and voice activated devices and could even include lone worker safety and security. This enables TEC to better meet the variety of needs of individuals.
 - Quality of installations for connected telecare is improved and less follow up visits required for rectifying faults and the ARC is fully updated with any changes to the sensors and peripherals installed at the person's home.

3.5.4 This proposal is the key project of the TEC Strategy. It enables the TEC service to move from being reactive to being preventative and to further develop with intelligent Lifelines to ultimately become predictive.

3.6 Benchmarking with other Local Authorities

3.6.1 To establish a proposal for Cambridgeshire, benchmarking has been conducted which looked at two areas comparing this proposal with practice in other Local Authorities.

The first area is whether other Local Authorities (LAs) make charges for those in receipt of a care package as well as those who do not meet eligibility criteria. Out of 17 LAs asked:

- No charges made for Lifelines – 1
- All customers means tested and charged – 3
- No means test but a standard charge for Lifeline – 10
- For those meeting eligibility charges included in care package – 4
- Hardship policy or directed to benefits support – 7

3.6.2 The second area of benchmarking looked at rates of charges with particular reference for charges by other Lifeline providers in the Cambridgeshire area. CCC's proposed charges are outlined in section 3.4.4.

Local Authority	Lifeline charge to customer (Charges exclude Value Added Tax (VAT) unless otherwise stated)
Lifeline Provider 1 (out of area)	£3 - £9 per week
Lifeline Provider 2 (out of area)	tiered service model, £3, £5, £7, £10
Lifeline Provider 3 (out of area)	weekly non means tested charge for all - £2.65 p/w 1200 service users:
Lifeline Provider 4 (out of area)	£4.40 p/w - includes mobile response £7.96 p/w for mobile SOS
Lifeline Provider 5 (out of area)	£3.60 p/w - monitoring only further £3.60 p/w for mobile response £10.50p/w - option for monitoring of telecare and GPS
Lifeline Provider 6 (out of area)	£3.50. Peripherals additional £1.25. Keysafe £60
Lifeline Provider 7 (out of area)	£4.35
Lifeline Provider 8 (out of area)	£6.15 per week. If on benefits £2.82
Local Lifeline Provider 1	£4.70 per week, £5.64 incl VAT. £45 for keysafe
Local Lifeline Provider 2	£4.10 per week, £39 installation fee, £71.50 to supply and fit keysafe
Local Lifeline Provider 3	£4.40 per week, £35 for installation, £45 for keysafe fitted
Local Lifeline Provider 4	£4.93 per week, £5.92 incl VAT. Keysafe 0.25 per week incl VAT. No installation charge
Local Lifeline Provider 5	£4.47 per week or £5.47 for mobile Doro unit. Installation charge £30. No keysafe installation included

3.6.3 Based on the above benchmarking the business case costed a range of charging options from £4.50 to £5.50 per week. £5.00 is the recommended charge from the Project Group because it is competitive compared with other local Lifeline providers and customers do not incur the up-front costs at the start of having a Lifeline, that customers report is a deterrent to agreeing to have a Lifeline. This charge excludes VAT as Lifeline Customers

are VAT exempt.

3.7 Project Interdependencies

3.7.1 Engagement with the below services has started to consider the resource implications for the project. Estimations for resource needed is detailed below.

Service	Requirement	Estimated resource
1. Mosaic	Mosaic would need to be configured to enable charging for Lifelines. TEC implementing use of Mosaic instead of SystemOne.	Business as usual change request. This project has already been approved.
2. IT	IT expertise to contribute to the ARC specification, equipment specifications, assessing the tender submissions and equipment demonstrations, software access to ARC platform	Registered as an IT project. Commitment to support the specifications for ARC and telecare equipment and contract awards. Resource required from IT will need to be reassessed once contract awarded. Implementation phase clashes with 2020 IT move out of Shire Hall.
3. Communications Team	Communications strategy to promote the new service to public and professionals, produce leaflets and add to TEC website	Business as usual request
4. Adults Finance Team	Raise quarterly invoices to customers at an estimated rate of 55 new customers per month	Impact of this proposal to be assessed during a review alongside a number of other workload changes
5. LGSS Finance	Means testing is inclusive of costs for Lifelines or assessing DRE	No change in numbers of people requiring means testing or DRE assessments
6. Long term teams	Care plans are inclusive of Lifelines as a means tested item.	Briefings at team meetings
7. NRS	Secure agreement with NRS to provide new products on ICES contract and operate a TEC substore	Business as usual request
8. Procurement	Support for tender process for the ARC	Business as usual request
9. LGSS Legal	Contract documents for ARC	One day

3.8 Stakeholders and Governance

3.8.1 Table of main stakeholders and their engagement with the project group:

Stakeholder	Engagement	Communication (method and frequency)
Cambs Lifeline Project Group	Key steering group and ownership of project plan	Monthly meetings, contact in-between as needed to progress

TEC team	For input and update	Fortnightly TEC team meetings
ARC Provider (current)	Notification prior to start of tender. Invitation to participate in tender	
ARC Provider (future)	Implementation of contract	Fortnightly implementation meetings
Joint Commissioning Board	Approval of business case and tender for ARC	Submission of business case Progress report on implementation
APCP TEC Steering Group	Kept informed of project progress	Representatives from CLP Project Group also attend TEC Steering Group Overview of implementation of CLP

3.8.2 The Project Group has had advice and guidance from the TEC Services Association (TSA). The TSA is the national organisation that sets the standards for telecare, assesses and accredits telecare services and products and advises government on strategic issues and developments in the field of telecare services. Funding for this nine month consultancy was approved as a part of ACPC Investment Tranche 3. Nathan Downing has been a member of the group to:

- Provide the Project Group with impartial and expert advice based on best available evidence, quality standards and models of good practice from other areas.
- Guide and support the Service Development Manager in the planning and implementation of this project, managing risks and promoting benefits and making proposals for managing the change process.
- Ensure the new model service is prepared for the digital switchover and making the most of the opportunity to deliver an end to end digital solution.
- Assist with benchmarking with other authorities to inform establishing a baseline for evidencing outcomes for the Cambridgeshire service.
- Assist with drafting a specification for Telecare Call Centre and external assessor in procurement decision making.

3.8.3 This proposal has been supported at the Practice Governance Board on 10th December 2019, the Adults and Safeguarding Management Team on 18th December 2019 and Joint Commissioning Board on the 23rd January 2020. This report is now being submitted to Adults Committee on 12th March 2020 followed by the General Purposes Committee.

3.9 Risks

3.9.1 The Project Group has completed a risk assessment. The table below includes the main risks scoring 15 or over (red) and 8-14 (amber) with their planned mitigation.

Risk	Risk level	Mitigation
Something not working at digital switchover	red	Proposal that Cambs TEC becomes a Lifeline provider. TEC purchases digital Lifelines only. TEC procures an ARC with digital platform. TEC

		liaises with other Lifeline providers in Cambs to minimise risks
Lifeline provision in Cambs very different from Peterborough	amber	Need for simplification greater in Cambs but ensure model proposed could include Peterborough at a future date
Costs of business case based on ARC charges of 55p per connection per week	amber	Completed extensive pre tender discovery work. Consultation with TSA
Digital Lifelines more expensive than standard Lifelines and are reliant on roaming sim cards	amber	Secured quotes from several main Lifeline suppliers. Assumed all customers would need sim card and included these costs in business case. Some customers may have broadband that can be utilised that would reduce overall costs of sim cards
Income is lower than expected due to lower referral rates to TEC but also higher numbers of people with care package and on benefits	amber	Communications strategy to raise awareness of TEC with public to promote awareness of TEC and referrals. Council website has a self-referral form to TEC. Baseline of TEC caseload has just 28% cases in receipt of care package. New referrals less likely to have a care package therefore impact delayed.
Not being competitive when compared with other Lifeline providers in the local area	amber	Benchmarking completed with other local providers. Retain advantages of reduced upfront charges and a free to customer for a trial period. Promote the extra advantages of Cambs TEC being part of other services in Prevention and Early Intervention and particularly the Enhance Response Service.
Equipment purchase through the ICES contract, however ICES contract is due for retender in March 2021	amber	Ensure ICES Commissioner is fully aware of this project and includes it in the refreshment of the specification for the ICES contract
Reduced income due to customers refusing to pay or inability to afford payments	amber	Develop guidance on managing hardship. Managers have discretion to fund Lifeline based on levels of risk of the individuals circumstances

3.10 Implementation Milestone plan

- 3.10.1 An implementation plan has been developed. It is anticipated that it would take eight months from approval of the business case to a 'go live' of the Cambs TEC Lifeline Service. The main areas that would need to be implemented include:

- Equipment selection and purchase through the Integrated Community Equipment Service - Months 1-4
- Complete a competitive tendering process for the Alarm Receiving Centre – Months 1-6
- Develop processes and protocols between ARC and TEC – Months 6-8
- Map and establish the financial processes and the configuration in Mosaic – Months 3-8
- Recruitment, selection and induction of TEC staff – Months 1-8
- Communications with internal and external customers to launch the new service – Months 7-8

The full implementation plan is available on request.

- 3.10.2 Based on approvals at relevant committees all going to plan and being completed by the end of March this timescale could mean that Cambridgeshire County Council is a Lifeline provider by November 2020 ahead of winter pressures.

4. SUMMARY

- 4.1 The Cambs Lifeline Project is an important service development that delivers considerable advantages for customers, TEC and Adult Social Care. It minimises the risks for the digital switchover, increases the preventative and early intervention offering and is essential for a further two proposals. The Committee are asked to support Transformation Funding of £172,406 for the start-up of the project. In year three the project will be covering its operation costs and making a net saving of £81,555 increasing to £182,608 in year 5. Future years will make similar savings as year 5, as well as still provide the social and health benefits to residents.

5. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

5.1 A good quality of life for everyone

The report above sets out the implications for this priority at section 3.5; this project enables the TEC service to move from being reactive to being preventative and to further develop with intelligent Lifelines to ultimately become predictive, improving the lives of some of the most vulnerable in society.

5.2 Thriving places for people to live

As well as the non-financial benefits, this proposal offers a return on investment after 3 years, which can be used to put back into council services. The report above sets out the implications for this priority at section 3.4.

5.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children

There are no significant implications for this priority.

5.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050

There are no significant implications for this priority.

6. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Resource Implications

The report above sets out details of significant implications in 3.7.

6.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications:

- There has been engagement with Sarah Fuller from Procurement who has offered advice for the support for tender process for the ARC.

6.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications:

- As per 6.2 above, as per the procurement of a suitable ARC there will be associated legal advice required for the contract.
- Risks and mitigating actions are listed in the report at section 3.9. These are to be managed via the implementation plan.
- The statutory implications are outlined above in sections 3.2.4 and 3.4.6 above.

6.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

Appendix 1 below sets out details of significant implications.

6.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

The report above sets out details of significant implications in 3.7.

6.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There has been engagement with Chair of the Adults Committee, Councillor Anna Bailey, who endorses option 2 at section 3.2.3 above. This report will be discussed in full at opposition leads and Chairs and Vice Chairs pre-meetings. There will also be engagement with Cllr Steve Count ahead of the March GPC.

6.7 Public Health Implications

The report above sets out the implications for this priority at section 0; this project enables the TEC service to move from being reactive to being preventative and to further develop with intelligent Lifelines to ultimately become predictive, improving the lives of some of the most vulnerable in society.

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Stephen Howarth
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?	Yes Name of Officer: Gus De Silva
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by Monitoring Officer?	Yes Name of Monitoring Officer: Fiona McMillan
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Emily Gutteridge
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Matthew Hall
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Charlotte Black
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Laurence Gibson

Source Documents	Location
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full financial costings 2. Implementation Plan 3. Risk Log 4. Specification for ARC 	<p>All documents are saved in the CCC Assistive Technology service area and are available on request.</p> <p>Contact: Jane.Crawford-White@cambridgesire.gov.uk</p>

COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Directorate / Service Area		Officer undertaking the assessment
People and Communities		Name: Emily Gutteridge Title: Senior Transformation Advisor Contact details: Emily.Gutteridge@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Service / Document / Function being assessed		
Cambridgeshire Technology Enabled Care (TEC) to become a Lifeline provider so that the income from the charges to customers funds the provision of the Lifeline service.		
Business Plan Proposal Number (if relevant)	n/a	
Aims and Objectives of Service / Document / Function		
<p>The aim of this project is to produce a viable business case for Cambridgeshire Technology Enabled Care (TEC) to become a Lifeline provider so that the income from the charges to customers funds the provision of the Lifeline service.</p> <p>TEC is a key and integral service that is part of the Prevention and Early Intervention Services for adult social care. Increasing the uptake of TEC is a core part of the Adults Positive Challenge Programme. This proposal will enhance the ability of TEC to achieve their targets and is an essential step prior to further developments and opportunities.</p>		
What is changing?		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) TEC becomes a lifeline provider 2. CCC TEC will charge for Lifelines – but this is no different if the customer went to any other local or national Lifeline provider 3. If someone cannot pay – managers' discretion to provide and fund based on level of risks in the persons circumstances. We will have developed a hardship policy with criteria as part of the implementation plan. 4. Minimising risks for customers associated with digital switchover. 		
Who is involved in this impact assessment?		
E.g. Council officers, partners, service users and community representatives.		
TEC service Commissioning Service development Transformation		

What will the impact be?

Impact	Positive	Neutral	Negative
Age	X		
Disability	X		
Gender reassignment		X	
Marriage and civil partnership		X	
Pregnancy and maternity		X	
Race		X	

Impact	Positive	Neutral	Negative
Religion or belief		X	
Sex		X	
Sexual orientation		X	
The following additional characteristics can be significant in areas of Cambridgeshire.			
Rural isolation	X		
Deprivation	X		

For each of the above characteristics where there is a positive, negative and / or neutral impact, please provide details, including evidence for this view. Describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts and how the actions are to be recorded and monitored. Describe any issues that may need to be addressed or opportunities that may arise.

Positive Impact
<p>Age: The Lifeline is largely used as a prevention and early intervention device for older people. The expectation is that reducing complexity in the service will increase the numbers of people benefitting from TEC.</p> <p>Disability: Charges could be applied at the flat rate for all people irrespective of whether they had a care package or not. However for those on benefits who undergo a financial assessment, the assessment will take into account their Disability Related Expenditure (DRE) for any community alarm system as per The Care Act's Care and Support Statutory Guidance. The Guidance specifically states "Community Alarms" as one of the key areas of DRE that must be considered as part of someone's financial assessment for care.</p> <p>Deprivation: As a countywide provider this would offer equal provision across for all residents. This will also mean that when there is the digital switch over, any costs / risks to the customer are mitigated against as this CCC as a Lifeline provider will already offer digital ready equipment. This will not be guaranteed if CCC are not the lifeline provider and costs may passed directly to the customer, some of who may not be able to afford the new equipment.</p> <p>Social / rural isolation: Lifelines enable independence and wellbeing for older people and those with disabilities and reduce anxiety for informal carers. With the newer mobile units the ability to summon help when outside the home environment enables greater social and community engagement.</p>
Negative Impact
<p>None identified.</p>
Neutral Impact
<p>The understanding of the Project Group is that this would not require a consultation with the public because this is a new service and there are no existing customers who would be impacted.</p>

Issues or Opportunities that may need to be addressed
None identified.

Community Cohesion

If it is relevant to your area you should also consider the impact on community cohesion.

Neutral impact