

Central Bedfordshire

Please select 'preliminary' Quality of written plan (y-axis):
Medium-Low Quality

Priority order for HWB Discussion	Review Area	Risk Category	Risk Applicable \ Line of Enquiry (please select from dropdown list)	Reviewer's Reasoning \Notes	Notes of discussion with HWB and Area Teams	Outcome Staus \ Pending HWB Action (please select staus from dropdown list in the first box)
Example	Analytics	Showstopper	A1-P4P: validity issue with values submitted - errors in plan values entered are causing incorrect results	DTOCs (in 6. HWB Supporting Metrics tab, template 1) shows increase in rate quarter on quarter for two quarters, but no rationale is given in the box provided (cell R29), as required by the guidance. Increase is fairly marginal on each so may be due to local factors	HWB understood the issue during the call and agreed to look into before the final assessment day	No longer a risk - if the following action is put in place (enter action in box below) A rationale is added to the required box for the red ratings in 6. HWB Supporting Metrics tab, template 1, that explains the increased DTOCs in the two quarters.
1	Analytics	Top Risks	A3-P4P: contextual information indicates that the non-elective plan may be under or over ambitious	i. The numerator increases from Q3 14/15 (5,357 admissions - cell F10) to Q414/15 (5,433 admissions - cell G10 – amber rating), and then suddenly decreases in Q1 (5,238 admissions – cell H10) and subsequent quarters. This amber rating in cell G10 needs to be explained. Clarification is required.	Central Bedfordshire (CB) to check the comment once received in writing	Risk remains outstanding Narrative will be added to Cell N9 in Part 2 submission. It will show - as any new schemes to avoid non-elective admissions will not be operational until q3 2014/15 at the earliest, it is suggested that there be no planned reduction in admissions in q4 2014/15.
2	Analytics	Further Risks	A6-Supporting Metrics: validity issue with values submitted - errors in plan values entered are causing incorrect results	The planned values for the Reablement metric is kept constant for both the years which requires an explanation<Ref: 6.HWB supporting metrics D19:E20>. Other schemes equates to 833k of savings (cells g126-130) with no change in activity or schemes identifying how they will be delivered	CB clarified that there will be no activity savings against the 833k identified as they are expecting efficiency savings. This is to be documented in the "how the saving was calculated" box.	No longer a risk - if the following action is put in place (enter action in box below) See column G
3	Analytics	Further Risks	A7-Supporting Metrics: the level of ambition for a given metric is not consistent with the quantified impact of the schemes contributing to it	i. Residential Admissions: No schemes included for 2014/15 or 2015/16 but supporting metrics tab highlights reductions (cell d11 and e11) ii. Reablement: No schemes for 2014/15 and 2015/16 (cell d21 and e21) highlights reductions iii. DTOC: No schemes for 2014/15. For 2015/16, annual change in admissions: -240 <cell N32 in 'HWB Supporting metrics'> is not matching with the benefits plan value: -597 <cell F125 in 'HWB Benefits Plan'> iv. Cross referencing is unclear. Which schemes from the narrative relate to which saving? It is currently unclear	CB to check the comment once received in writing	Risk remains outstanding Accept comments and further work to clarify will be undertaken as required
4	Analytics	Further Risks	A8-Supporting Metrics: contextual information indicates that the plan(s) may be under or over ambitious	Reablement: The annual change in proportion for 2014/15 reasonable at 15% <cell D22>, but is planned at 0% for 2015/16 <cell E22> DTOC: Annual change in admissions in 2014/15 is planned to grow substantially at 33.2% <cell J33>, but reduces at a rate of 5.1% <cell N33> in 2015/16. Such fluctuations have also been observed in the baseline quarters. Clarification required	CB to check the comment once received in writing	Risk remains outstanding Accept comments and further work to clarify will be undertaken as required
5	Analytics	Further Risks	A9-Supporting Metrics: under or over ambitious plans are not explained fully or appropriately	Red ratings are visible in Q2 and Q3 of 2014/15 plans, but no rationale is provided for the same i. DTOC red ratings (cell H29-I29) require an explanation in cell R29. ii. DTOC higher than trend line in tab 7.	CB to provide rationale in boxes as agreed on the call	No longer a risk - if the following action is put in place (enter action in box below) See column G

6	Analytics	Further Risks	A10-Supporting Metrics: information provided on Patient Experience Metric is not valid	No figure submitted for patient experience metric	Not discussed on the call due to time restrictions	Risk remains outstanding Awaiting national metric. In the interim we will be devising local indicators based on a number of perception surveys.
7	Narrative	Showstopper	N1-The National Conditions have not been met	ii) 7 day services to support discharge The plan does not clearly articulate how local partners will work together to ensure that NHS providers will meet the milestones for delivery of the clinical standards for 7DS. iv) Joint assessment and accountable lead professional for high-risk populations The plan articulates the proportion of the adult population identified as at a high risk of hospital admission. However there is currently no formal risk stratification tool in use and the plans to address this are not sufficiently detailed.	The HWB understood the issue during the call and agreed to address it before the final assessment day. In relation to 7DS the HWB will articulate the work with acute providers already underway on clinical standards (e.g. in relation to winter planning). In relation to risk stratification the HWB will articulate the process by which it will ensure that a systematic approach is taken. This matter will be clarified in the revised BCF plan submission. CB indicate that there is not a formal risk stratification tool. More evidence is required to highlight the current work that has been underway. (e.g CB have also been doing work on identifying patient groups and choosing patients to actively case manage).	No longer a risk - if the following action is put in place (enter action in box below) CB to provide more clarity and evidence on working with 7 providers across Bedfordshire with regards to risk stratification and 7 day services to support discharge
8	Narrative	Top Risks	N3-The plan does not describe a clear overarching vision for the future of health and social care in the local area	The plan is not sufficiently quantified and supported by the relevant data. It would benefit from visualisations of the data that illustrate local issues and a quantified articulation of how integration and the BCF will be used to improve issues. It is also not clear what aspects of the desired change would not be delivered without the BCF. The case for change makes the more general case for service integration.	The HWB understood the issue during the call and agreed to address it before the final assessment day. The revised submission will quantify the changes and improvements required to deliver the BCF vision in terms of activity and quality measures and metrics (e.g. NHS Constitution measures, patient reported outcome measures).	Risk remains outstanding See column G
9	Narrative	Top Risks	N4-The plan does not sufficiently explain how the overarching vision will be achieved	High level milestones are included for each of the four programmes. However many do not have clear delivery dates and expected outcomes/deliverables. It is also not clear which officer/organisation is responsible for the delivery of each milestone. The co-dependencies have not been articulated.	The HWB understood the issue during the call and agreed to address it before the final assessment day. Whilst recognising that the BCF programmes have yet to be articulated in full business cases, high level 'gateway' milestones and trajectories will be set out for each programme.	No longer a risk - if the following action is put in place (enter action in box below) See column G
10	Narrative	Top Risks	N5-The plan is not aligned	While the submission asserts that the BCF plan is aligned with other initiatives related to care and support, the inter-dependencies and responsibilities are not clearly articulated. While there is a high degree of overlap with initiatives highlighted within the two year operating plan, the plan does not confirm that all BCF schemes are included in the two year plan. It is not clear how this difference will be managed or dealt with in future plans.	CB to include the confirmation (ie. Venn diagram) in the re-submitted document and just needs to be evidenced (information is currently available to clarify this)	No longer a risk - if the following action is put in place (enter action in box below) See column G
11	Narrative	Top Risks	N7-There is insufficient detail as to how the schemes will be delivered	Milestones are included for each of the six schemes. However many do not have clear delivery dates and expected outcomes/deliverables. It is also not clear which officer/organisation is responsible for the delivery of each milestone. The co-dependencies have not been articulated. Each scheme would benefit from a clear implementation plan.	The HWB understood the issue during the call and agreed to address it before the final assessment day. Whilst recognising that the BCF schemes have yet to be articulated in full business cases, high level 'gateway' milestones and trajectories will be set out for each scheme.	No longer a risk - if the following action is put in place (enter action in box below) See column G
12	Narrative	Further Risks	N8-Insufficient documentation of the risks	High level risk and mitigating actions have been identified. However the potential impact of these has not been adequately quantified. The mitigating actions are not sufficiently precise and tangible and they do not have an agreed owner and timeline. The submission indicates that the work on developing appropriate risk sharing arrangements has yet to be completed.	KPMG make reference to pg. 29- section risks and contingency. Agreement that the column in template needs to be completed highlighting financial risk The HWB understood the issue during the call and agreed to address it before the final assessment day. The financial implications of all relevant risks and mitigating actions will be quantified and incorporated in the risk table.	No longer a risk - if the following action is put in place (enter action in box below) See column G

13	Finance	Top Risks	F3-Schemes are not financially evidence-based or financially modelled adequately for full benefits realisation	The schemes covered in part one Annex 1 are not matching with schemes mentioned in HWB benefits plan < Ref: BCF plan part 2 4.HWB benefits plan and BCF plan part 1 Annexure 1 pages 66-112>.	Not discussed on the call due to time restrictions	Risk remains outstanding Please see Better Care Fund Plan - High Level Schemes in Part One.
14	Finance	Top Risks	F4-BCF financial risks are not fully identified, inadequate contingencies, lack ownership	One explicit financial risk, "Funds will not be released from the Acute Sector which could undermine pooled finances for BCF investment", has been highlighted. However, it has not been quantified. The financial impact of proposed mitigating actions has also not been quantified. The financial impact of non delivery of the reduction of 3.5% (757) on non elective admissions valued at £1,128.000 <Ref: BCF plan part 1 section 5a and 5b page 29-36> There is little evidence of analytics and modelling in the contingency plan.	The HWB understood the issue during the call and agreed to address it before the final assessment day. The financial implications of all relevant risks and mitigating actions will be quantified and incorporated in the risk table.KPMG make reference to pg. 29- section risks and contingency. Agreement that the column in template needs to be completed highlighting financial risk	No longer a risk - if the following action is put in place (enter action in box below) See column G
15	Finance	Top Risks	F5-Full budgets are not identified to meet the additional costs resulting from the new Care Act duties	i) The social care figure has been mentioned as £8,973k (Summary: D18) for FY 2015/16 but the amount allocated for the protection of adult social care has been mentioned as £5,556k <Summary: F18>. The explanation for this discrepancy is that 'The Council is contributing an additional amount of £3.417 to the BCF and therefore this is not considered as protecting Adult Social Care' <Summary: G18>. Clarification required in documentation.	Not discussed on the call due to time restrictions	Risk remains outstanding Wording to be revised as required
16	Finance	Top Risks	F6-Full budgets are not identified to meet the cost of carers	i) A sum of £0.482m in 2015/16 has been allocated for carer specific services <Ref: BCF plan part 2 section 7a(v) page 46> ii) None of the services that will be commissioned with the above contract have been listed.	Not discussed on the call due to time restrictions	Risk remains outstanding Further clarification of your comments required.
17	Finance	Further Risks	F8-Insufficient funding for critical schemes	The scheme names mentioned in 4.HWB benefits tab is not matching with schemes covered in the narrative plan. Few schemes included in the narrative discuss the investment requirements but the totals are not corroborating with those included in the benefits plan < Ref: BCF plan part 2 4.HWB benefits plan and BCF plan part 1 Annexure 1 pages 66-112>	Not discussed on the call due to time restrictions	Risk remains outstanding Part two template does not offer flexibility or support clear alignment of benefits to schemes. Investment and benefits is identified in each scheme as per Annex 1
18	Finance	Further Risks	F9- Unrealistic savings	There is no 2014/15 data andthe schemes covered in the narrative do not match with those covered in the benefits plan The scheme names mentioned in 4.HWB benefits tab is not matching with schemes covered in the narrative plan. Few schemes included in the narrative discuss their impact on P4P metric and supporting metrics but the totals are not corroborating with those included in the benefits plan < Ref: BCF plan part 2 4.HWB benefits plan and BCF plan part 1 Annexure 1 pages 66-112> Data has been provided only for delayed transfers (2015/16) and doesn't match 240 (HWB Supporting Metrics: N32) Vs 597 (HWB	Not discussed on the call due to time restrictions	Risk remains outstanding We do not agree with these comments. Our plan sets out our high level schemes and constituent parts which are shown in Part One.