

Report Title:	Report to Cabinet on Award of Contract for Adult Social Care Case Management System
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Cabinet Member:	Cllr David Coppinger
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet 27th April 2023
Responsible Officer(s):	Kevin McDaniel Executive Director Adult Social Care and Health
Wards affected:	All

www.rbwm.gov.uk



REPORT SUMMARY

This report seeks Cabinet approval to award a contract for the supply and maintenance of a new case management system for adult social care. The current case management system used by Optalis to deliver adult social care outcomes on behalf of RBWM is outdated. The current system does not support the automation of adult social care finance and does not have the functionality to increase choice, control and self-service for residents and providers. The system has reached ‘end of life’ support from the supplier and therefore is at increased risk of data breaches and security vulnerability due to the lack of further security updates and development capabilities.

A new case management system has been procured which will provide additional functionality and will support more efficient billing processes and improved data and performance information.

Suppliers were invited to submit bids using a Crown Commercial Services Framework, a thorough review of technical responses was conducted, with clarifications sought from bidders, technical demonstrations were conducted with a large user group to ensure that the products met our stated requirements.

The proposals in this report will support the vision of **Creating a sustainable borough of opportunity and innovation** by ensuring Adult Social Care remains at the forefront of innovative delivery. The new system will support further development of strengths-based practice ensuring older residents and residents with disabilities will be supported to remain independent for as long as possible with the right levels of care and support provided at the right time. Over time, the system will provide greater self-service opportunities for residents giving people increased control over and access to their own support plans. It will enable accurate financial planning and charging supporting the Borough’s budget position. Improved financial processes will reduce the risk of accrued debt due to delayed billing.

Financial processes will be automated which will support accurate budget forecasting and in phase two of the implementation the provision of a provider portal alongside continued market development and sustainability planning will create the right conditions for a flourishing independent social care provider sector.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Agrees the award of £910,381 for the supply, implementation and maintenance of the Mosaic Case Management System (CSM). This will be funded from capital budgets already approved in the 2023/24 budget.

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Options

Table 1: Options arising from this report

Options	Advantages	Disadvantages	General Comments
Option 1 Do Nothing	<p>This option would mean continuing with the current system and approach.</p> <p>No procurement activity or implementation</p>	<p>Leaves the council at high risk of failure to comply with statutory requirements, (Care Funding Reforms and annual statutory returns), local performance management, inadequate practice model and system security issue.</p> <p>Likely financial risk arising from the more complex and comprehensive financial requirements of the care funding reforms which cannot be delivered via the current system.</p> <p>Risk of reputational damage should major security incident or attack takes place.</p> <p>System reached 'end of life' support.</p> <p>Risk of non-compliance with procurement law</p>	<p>The 'do nothing' option has already been discounted by the approval to go out to market to tender for a replacement case management system.</p> <p>This option is not recommended</p>
Option 2 Undertake internal bespoke development	<p>No procurement activity</p> <p>Use of internal IT and Application support team resources and capability to develop bespoke system for the department</p>	<p>Requires specialist resource skills, infrastructure, security and tools which is currently lacking</p> <p>May cost more and may struggle to fully meet local and statutory requirement. Also likely to take considerably longer,</p>	<p>This option will require the business to rely on skilled staff within Applications Support team and IT to deliver</p> <p>Investment in infrastructure is</p>

Options	Advantages	Disadvantages	General Comments
	<p>May host system locally and lockdown to prevent possible cyber attack,</p>	<p>increasing the risk of lack of readiness for implementing the Care Funding Reforms in October 2023.</p> <p>Locking down the system to prevent possible security risk will undermine the strategic plan for new ways of working, partnership and integration.</p> <p>Risk of non-compliance with procurement law</p>	<p>required to maintain and host the system securely</p> <p>This option is not recommended</p>
<p>Option 3</p> <p>Consider Joint Partnership Implementation with other LA's</p>	<p>May cost less to implement and support.</p> <p>Enhance partnership working with other LAs.</p> <p>Shared business/ practice model and joint security responsibility</p>	<p>Could take longer to implement and unclear whether there is a willing LA partner in the same position</p> <p>Uncertainty in the long term should the partnership cease</p> <p>Joint responsibility for data quality, or future migration requirement may be a challenge if proper protocols are not in place.</p> <p>May be subject to provider terms and conditions.</p> <p>Risk of non-compliance with procurement law</p>	<p>This approach may require alignment of operational business practice and change management, otherwise there is a risk of pathway duplication and integration issues especially in regard to finance.</p> <p>This option is not recommended</p>
<p>Option 4</p> <p>This is the recommended option</p> <p>Procure and implement new system via approved framework</p>	<p>Compliant with procurement law</p> <p>Quicker procurement approach and with Framework approved suppliers.</p> <p>Securely hosted system that meets industry standards and accreditations.</p> <p>Compliant with statutory requirement, including statutory reporting and supports</p>	<p>Suppliers may not be fully compliant with Charging Reform Requirement by October 2023 but there is active collaboration with the government to ensure compliance.</p> <p>Short-term cost for implementation may be higher but overall benefit will outweigh cost.</p> <p>Implementation timeline challenging and as such specialist resource</p>	<p>Coordination with Achieving for Children (AfC) during data migration and decommissioning due to joint use of legacy system</p>

Options	Advantages	Disadvantages	General Comments
	<p>implementation of the Statutory Charging Reform requirements by October 2025.</p> <p>Established finance integration interfaces, Portals and other APIs.</p> <p>Cost effective in terms of quality, implementation time, security, hosting and practice model development etc.</p>	<p>requirement is needed to achieve timely delivery.</p>	

Three other options have been considered as set out in the table above and summarised below:

These are not the recommended options;

Option 1-Do nothing

Option 2-Undertake bespoke internal development

Option 3-Joint Partnership Implementation with other Local Authorities

Option 4 – Procurement of a new system. This is the **recommended option** – it offers the quickest solution, implementation and compliance with statutory and local requirements.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 What does success look like, how is it measured, what are the stretch targets?

Table 2: Key Implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
RBWM able to ensure compliance with new legislation, deliver efficient charging	RBWM is in breach of new legislation governing care charging and inspection	New system in place and new business processes established	N/A	N/A	1 st June 2024

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
processes, improve workflows leading to reduction of risk for vulnerable residents.					

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

A Capital allocation of £1.150m has been agreed by Full Council as part of the 2023/24 budget setting process. In addition, there is £0.200m of capital budget that has been approved in previous years, resulting in a total capital budget of £1.350m. Following payment of software licence cost and implementation there is a remainder of £439,619 from the allocated budget cost which will be used for associated implementation costs	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

- 4.1 Where feasible costs will be met from capital budgets, but work in respect of data cleansing and transfer, and project management costs pre-award, are not eligible to be capitalised. Funding for these has already been agreed within the revenue budget.

Table 3: Financial impact of report's recommendations

REVENUE COSTS	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Additional total	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£0

CAPITAL COSTS	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Additional total	£0	£0	£910,381
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£910,381

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Council has the power to take the action proposed, pursuant to Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 which provides powers for a local authority to do anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the discharge of any of their functions. The action proposed is also taken in

accordance with Part 8A – Contract and Tendering Procedure Rules - of the Constitution.

5.2 The procurement team have been involved in this project from the outset and are key members of the project team.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

Table 4: Impact of risk and mitigation

Risk	Level of uncontrolled risk	Controls	Level of controlled risk
End of System Life Support – Risk of breakdown or Cyber Attack will leave RBWM with no system Option 1 – Do Nothing	Low	There is an agreement between RBWM and supplier (Civica), but the lack of security updates and legacy system old technology platform prevents mitigation of risk	High
Non-compliance with Charging Reform Requirement, Statutory Returns and inadequate practice model Option 1 – Do Nothing	Low	Accepted risk because system has reached end of life support with no further development that can make the system compliant. Minor changes are possible but the outdated technology means that only limited changes can be made	Low
Specialist skills, resources and platforms/ infrastructure necessary to support adequate internal development Option 2 - bespoke development	Low	Significant investment needed to recruit internal applications development staff, specialist IT staff, infrastructure and platforms to develop a fit for purpose integrated system that is compliant with Charging Reform Requirement and security standards. The team are currently under-resources to and would lack ability to undertake full development appraisal in the current state.	High
Delayed implementation due to shared	Low	For this option to succeed, there will need to be closer partnership	High

partnership and strategic realignment Option 3		arrangement and strategic realignment between partner or neighbouring LAs. Such arrangement will take time and effort. May be costly initially depending on adopted approach and solution.	
Supplier readiness, funding and resource commitment to achieve timely implementation Option 4 – The recommended Option.	Low	Procurement via Crown Commercial Services (CCS) Framework to speed up the award and implementation process. On track. Tender process completed and recommendation to award contract is for Cabinet approval. CMS Project Manager in post. Resource plan developed and pending funding to recruit to posts for the implementation. Pre-implementation work in progress to reduce risk of delay.	Medium
		Risk of financial impact of annual support and maintenance of legacy Paris system if Achieving for Children delay implementation of their social care system and there is a need to continue to use Paris.	

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 7.1 Equalities. Equality Impact Assessments are published on the [council's website](#). The Equality Act 2010 places a statutory duty on the council to ensure that when considering any new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure the impacts on particular groups, including those within the workforce

and customer/public groups, have been considered. The EQIA screening tool is attached as an appendix.

- 7.2 Climate change/sustainability. The new system will reduce reliance on paper systems thus reducing waste and reducing the use of paper.
- 7.3 Data Protection/GDPR/People Implications
- 7.4 The opportunity for increased automation means a small number of staff will be impacted. It is anticipated that those staff affected will be needed for new roles required as part of Care Funding Reforms due to be implemented in October 2025
- 7.5 Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) has been completed with risks identified which can be mitigated. DPIA is attached.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1 To include:
- Mandatory consultations have been completed.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 9.1 Implementation date if not called in: The full implementation stages are set out in table 5.

Table 5: Implementation timetable

Date	Details
May 2023	Migration planning has already started. Implementation of the new system will begin once the contract is awarded.
20/06/23 – 21/08/23	Stage 1 – Project Initiation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to key areas - Infrastructure Deployment - Data Migration Specification - Integration Specification - Reporting Specification - Portal Specification - Workflow Specification - Training Plan
19/07/23 – 30/05/24	State 2 – Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation Workshops - Case Management - Finance Case Management & Provider Portal Workshops - Mosaic Portal Specification Workshops - Finance Configuration - Configuration Testing (CMS & Finance) - UAT - Data Migration Extract and Testing (Iterative) - End User Training - Stage 2 Quality Gate Review

15/05/24 – 15/08/24	Stage 3 – Go Live - Go Live rehearsal - Freeze Existing System (i.e. Paris etc) - Final Extract & Load - Go Live
03/06/24 – 22/07/24	Project Closure - Review of issues and deliverables against PID - Post Go-Live Lessons Learnt - Project Closure Report - Project Closed

10. APPENDICES

10.1 This report is supported by two appendices

- Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment
- Appendix B - Data Protection Impact Assessment

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

11.1 This report is supported by no background documents:

12. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Statutory Officers (or deputies)</i>	
Andrew Vallance	Interim Sec 151 Officer	28th March 2023	17th April 2023
Elaine Browne	Interim Monitoring Officer	28th March 2023	29th March 2023
<i>Deputies:</i>			
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Procurement Manager (or deputy) - if report requests</i>	

<i>approval to award, vary or extend a contract</i>			
Lyn Hitchinson	Procurement Manager	22nd March 2023	24th March 2023
<i>Other consultees:</i>			
<i>Directors (where relevant)</i>			
Tony Reeves	Chief Executive		
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place		
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of People Services	28th March 2023	28th March 2023
<i>Heads of Service (where relevant)</i>			
N/A	Head of		
	Head of		
	Head of		
<i>External (where relevant)</i>			
	N/A		

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted	Cabinet Member for Adults and Health	Yes
---------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
Key decision: First entered into the Cabinet Forward Plan: 6th July 2022	No	No

Report Author: Katharine Willmette Interim ASC Consultant
