

**RECORD OF DECISION BY CITY MAYOR OR INDIVIDUAL
EXECUTIVE MEMBER**

1.	DECISION TITLE	Proposal for the Future of Mobile Meals Provision
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	None
3.	DATE OF DECISION	30 th April 2014
4.	DECISION MAKER	Assistant City Mayor – Adult Social Care
5.	DECISION TAKEN	To cease the current arrangements for the provision of mobile meals by Leicester City Council and its currently contracted providers as detailed in option 4.
6.	REASON FOR DECISION	<p>The numbers of people using the service have been reducing significantly; as people are choosing to spend their personal budget in other ways and eligibility for services has reduced numbers further. As at 1st April 2014, the number of people using the service has dropped to 220. Reflecting a 68% drop in numbers since April 2012. Consequently the unit cost of providing the service has increased by 44% over the period from 2011/12 to 2013/14.</p> <p>A decision is required to ensure we have provision that is fit for purpose and offers value for money, enabling the Council to support people to remain living independently within their own homes.</p>
7.	a) KEY DECISION Y/N? b) If yes, was it published 5 clear days in advance? y/n	a) Yes b) Yes
8.	OPTIONS CONSIDERED	<p>These include alternative proposals put forward as part of the consultation.</p> <p>Option 1. Do nothing. This is not an option because the service is financially unviable.</p> <p>Option 2. Expand the in house service by actively marketing and attracting people into the service. An increase in numbers would improve the economies of scale and overall viability.</p> <p>Following a request from the Adult Social Care scrutiny committee, financial modelling has been undertaken and this shows that this is not a viable option. For eligible service users the level of subsidy</p>

RECORD OF DECISION BY CITY MAYOR OR INDIVIDUAL
EXECUTIVE MEMBER

		<p>is very high and increasing their numbers would only serve to increase the council's deficit. It is highly improbable that service users would be able/willing to meet the full cost. The prospect of any significant numbers of self-funders taking the service is low, given the cost, and in any case the council is not permitted to make a profit on its dealings with self-funders so any economies of scale would benefit the self-funder rather than the council.</p> <p>Regardless of the above an in-house service would be more expensive than external provision due to the terms and conditions of its staff.</p> <p>A report of this work is also attached.</p> <p>Option 2 would lead to increased costs and is not financially viable.</p> <p>Option 3. Merge the service with Leicestershire County provision (shared services). An increase in overall numbers would improve economies of scale and overall viability.</p> <p>The County does not have an in-house service, instead purchasing its services from an external provider so a shared service option is not possible.</p> <p>Option 4. Cease the current provision. Service users would be supported to choose alternative meal support options through the support planning process. There would be 4 commissioning options. Service users could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use a direct payment to meet their needs in the way they choose • receive domiciliary care to heat or prepare a meal • receive support to order meals provision • receive an alternative hot meal delivery (purchased via a Council contracted provider). <p>The Council would undertake a procurement exercise to ensure it has providers of culturally appropriate, high quality meals that meet dietary and nutritional requirements for all those who may need this service.</p> <p>Option 4 is the recommended option.</p> <p>Option 5. Cease the current provision. Service users would be</p>
--	--	--

**RECORD OF DECISION BY CITY MAYOR OR INDIVIDUAL
EXECUTIVE MEMBER**

		<p>supported to choose alternative meal support options through the support planning process. There would be 4 commissioning options. Service users could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use a direct payment to take maximum control for their service • use a managed direct payment to enable choice and flexibility without the responsibility for organising and managing the process • receive domiciliary care to heat or prepare a meal • receive support to order meals provision <p>This option is similar to option 4 but instead of the Council purchasing meals via a contract for those who cannot have their needs met appropriately using other options, customers would be able to use a managed personal budget.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>DEADLINE FOR CALL-IN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 Members of a Scrutiny Commission or any 5 Councillors can ask for the decision to be called-in. • Notification of Call-In with reasons must be made to the Monitoring Officer 	<p>7 MAY 2014.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>SIGNATURE OF DECISION MAKER (City Mayor or where delegated by the City Mayor, name of Executive Member)</p>	