

Executive Briefing

Proposal for the future of mobile meals provision

Lead Director: Tracie Rees
Briefing Date: 31st October 2013

Useful information

- Ward(s) affected: City-wide
- Report author: Mercy Lett-Charnock
- Author contact details: 37 2377

1. Summary

- 1.1 On 4th October 2012 the Executive gave approval to consult on the future of the Council's mobile meals provision.
- 1.2 The service comprises three elements:
 - All meals are delivered by City Transport
 - Some meals are purchased from an external provider and re-heated by City Catering
 - Some meals are cooked fresh and delivered by two external providers
 - East West Community Project (EWCP) and
 - West Indian Senior Citizen's Project (WISCP)
- 1.3 A formal consultation exercise has been completed and the Executive is requested to make a decision about the future of the service taking into consideration the findings from the consultation and the Council's strategic and financial priorities.
- 1.4 The statutory consultation ran from 9th July to 7th October 2013 on the following proposal:
 - Stopping the Council's current mobile meals service and helping people to prepare or obtain meals in alternative and more flexible ways

It should be noted that the Council does not cook any meals and its role is limited to re-heating and delivering some of the meals.
- 1.5 The numbers of people using the service has been reducing significantly as the eligibility criteria is being robustly applied and people are choosing to use their personal budget to buy alternative services. There are currently 236 people using the service, reflecting a 34% drop in numbers since April 2012. Consequently the unit cost of providing the service has increased by 43% over the period from 2010/11 to 2012/13.
- 1.6 The consultation has found that users would like to continue to receive a hot meal and those involved in the provision and delivery of the current service are concerned about the quality of alternative options. These issues are addressed in the report.
- 1.7 Information relating to the consultation process and key findings are detailed in the report. However, the overall recommendation is to cease the service as it is no longer financially viable and people's needs can be met in more flexible ways, especially as there are suitable alternative providers and options available.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 The Executive is recommended to approve ceasing the current mobile meal service with individuals being supported to prepare or obtain meals in an alternative way, as detailed in Option 4.
- 2.2 In order to ensure both the nutritional and social needs of service users are met there will be a number of service options available to people who need support with obtaining or preparing a meal in future. These will be:
 - Direct payments, so people can make their own arrangements
 - Domiciliary care to heat or prepare a meal
 - Support to order meals provision
 - A managed service via the Council from a Framework Agreement (this would meet nutritional and quality standards)

3. Background

- 3.1 The number of people using the service has dropped significantly over the last few years and as demand reduces, the costs have increased for City Transport, City Catering and Adult Social Care (ASC). The Council subsidised the service by £396k in 2012/13 and the service is becoming financially unviable.
- 3.2 As part of the ASC Transformation Programme, the move to personal budgets has meant more service users are choosing alternative meal provision. Demand for the current service has fallen and it is forecast to continue falling, resulting in an increasing average cost.
- 3.3 For 2012/13 the average gross cost to the Council per meal was £7.76, representing a total annual gross cost of £607k. If this situation continues the average cost to the Council per meal could rise by 50% to around £12.00 over the next 3 years.
- 3.4 There are currently 236 service users in receipt of a mobile meal, but the number of people using the service has been declining year on year. The decline in the number of meals has been evident for some time, as follows:

2009/10 = 168,000
2010/11 = 159,000
2011/12 = 112,000
2012/13 = 78,000

- 3.5 National policy, such as the Putting People Concordat (2007), promotes independence and gives people greater choice and control over the services they receive.
- 3.6 Therefore, it is necessary to ensure that people have choice and control, which enables people to live independently and delivers value for money.

Consultation Process

- 3.7 Statutory consultation was carried out between 9 July and 7 October 2013. The following proposal was based on the falling demand and increasing level of subsidy paid by the Council.

Stopping the Council's current mobile meals service and helping people to prepare or obtain meals in alternative and more flexible ways.

Information relating to the consultation process can be found at Appendix 1.

Summary of Findings

3.8 Service Users

In general, service users either appreciate or rely on the service and wish to continue receiving a hot meal. 56% of those that responded receive a meal every day. The majority of those who responded (80%) still want a hot meal delivered to them and comments highlight they would prefer this to be via the Council as it is now. However, a few comments indicate that some people recognise the current financial pressures on the Council and the availability of alternatives that weren't possible until recently means that the service needs to change.

- Officer Response: There will still be a hot meal service if required through alternative options

38% of those who responded feel the full cost would not offer value for money. 33% felt that the full cost would be good or very good value for money, if they were asked to pay the full amount. Comments made on the questionnaires indicate that there would be some people who would be willing to pay more if it meant a good quality nutritious meal, whereas others could not afford any increase.

- Officer Response: Costs will be considered when planning future options

A notable proportion (32%) of respondents felt they would miss someone calling on a daily basis and therefore the need for a meal was not the only benefit from the service. Some comments show this is linked to concerns about what would happen if they no longer received a daily visit. 30% felt that they would need help and support to find alternatives if the service was stopped.

- Officer Response: When people are assessed for social care support, the assessment considers all their needs including social interaction and community involvement.

A large number of service users (46%) stated that they need appropriate meals for religious or cultural reasons and 62% have one or more specific dietary needs, the most common being vegetarian or diabetic. Some people have also commented that they are concerned that any new arrangements may not provide the nutrition they need.

- Officer Response: The Council has a duty to ensure people's cultural, dietary and nutritional needs are met and will take this into account when making any service changes and as part of the assessment process for

individuals.

3.9 Trade Unions, staff and stakeholder groups

The main concern from staff and unions was the suggestion that the Council had deliberately run the service down. It was also suggested that the reasons why the number had declined were not fully understood.

- Officer Response: Information relating to one case has been put forward by Unison, which was not substantiated and an explanation has been provided. Social work staff are required to offer people choice as part of the personalisation agenda, as well as offering the existing mobile meal service and since July 2013 15 new service users are now in receipt of the service. However, despite 15 new people using the service, overall the numbers continue to decline.

A suggestion was made by the unions that the service should be promoted to increase usage and make it more cost effective.

- Officer Response: As explained in the previous point, social work staff do offer the service, which is demonstrated by the number of new service users who are now in receipt of the service.

It was felt that there were risks if people went directly to providers who had not been vigorously quality-checked.

- Officer Response: Concerns over commissioned services could be mitigated by a robust contracting process which includes health and safety as well as nutritional requirements. The Council contracted providers will be required to meet the National Association of Care Caterers guidelines. Those who take a direct payment will be monitored to ensure their needs are being met.

Concerns were raised about isolation and welfare (including nutrition), particularly the benefits of a daily check.

- Officer Response: Where people are eligible and require support other than the meal itself (e.g. support to avoid social isolation), these needs will be taken to account in individual assessments. People's nutritional requirements will be considered and a hot meal from a provider meeting required standards could be organised. However, where service users have capacity they can make their own food choices.

Concerns were raised about the direct payment amount being sufficient.

- Officer Response: People receiving a mobile meal currently contribute £3.05 for the cost of the food, if they continue to do this in future and spend the £2.28 direct payment amount (this is the amount given to prepare a meal) they will have £5.33 to spend on every meal. Soft market testing suggests that meals can be purchased from between £1.48 and £5.95 for frozen meals and £3.60 and £7.71 for a hot meal, including delivery.

Appendix 2 and 3 contain detailed union and staff feedback.

3.10 Current providers

Current providers had concerns about the potential for any change to impact on their business (viability) and as a result other work that they do. A reduction in the numbers using services has already begun to have an impact.

- Officer Response: Consideration will be given to the impact on current providers and any mitigating actions that may be required. However, the Council cannot guarantee future business for specific organisations. Information will be provided to prospective users in future and the current organisations could be included on that information.

They felt that information could be given to self-funders about providers which would help them develop their business, but that there could be risks if people chose cheaper options from places without such rigorous checks than they currently go through.

- Officer Response: Information for self funders is being considered as part of the Information, Advice and Guidance strategy and providers can currently market their own services to self-funders and via ChooseMySupport or in future an e-directory. People taking a direct payment are able to choose from providers not regulated by the Council, but any Council appointed provision via a Framework Agreement would meet quality standards.

They stressed the need for culturally-appropriate meals, and that some types of food, such as Caribbean, cost more due to the higher cost of ingredients.

- Officer Response: The Council recognises that some meals may be more expensive for customers to purchase, however the food element of a meal is the responsibility of the customer and the Council is responsible only for ensuring a customer is able to obtain or prepare that meal. Soft market testing shows there are providers of culturally appropriate meals available for service users to purchase directly and where the Council is commissioning services, it will ensure that value for money and appropriate options are available.

3.11 A detailed discussion of the financial, legal, equalities and workforce implications of the proposals can be found in section 6 of the report. The Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) in Appendix 6 of this report describes in detail how the Council might mitigate against negative customer impacts.

Specific alternative proposals made by those consulted

3.12 Promote and increase take up of the in house service to improve economies of scale (this may include consideration of increasing cost to service users).

3.13 Joining with the County mobile meals provision to improve economies of scale.

The consultation summary can be found at appendix 4.

Soft market testing

- 3.14 At the same time the consultation was underway, a soft market testing exercise was undertaken to establish what provision was available for service users who wanted to use their direct payment to purchase meals as well as what providers are potentially willing and able to contract with the Council if it was required. The findings are included at Appendix 5.
- 3.15 In summary, it suggests there are appropriate providers in the market but that in some areas such as providers of Caribbean meals there may be limited choice/availability. However, a procurement exercise would be more likely to receive a response than soft market testing, where there is little incentive for providers to respond. Desk top work and information known informally via lunch clubs and other contracting contacts suggests there are other providers who may be interested in providing meals, that did not respond via this process.

4. Options and impacts

4.1 Options - These include alternative proposals put forward as part of the Consultation process.

4.1.1 Option 1. Do nothing.

The advantage of this option:

- The service would continue to be provided in the same way

The disadvantages of this option:

- The number of service users are declining and the level of subsidy paid by the Council will continue to increase

4.1.2 Option 2. Expand the in house service by actively marketing and attracting people into the service.

The advantage of the this option:

- An increase in numbers would improve the economies of scale and overall viability

The disadvantages of this option:

- The service is only available to people eligible for ASC support and they are already given the choice of using the service and therefore numbers are unlikely to rise further

4.1.3 Option 3. Merge the service with Leicestershire County provision (shared services).

The advantages of this option:

- An increase in overall numbers would improve economies of scale and overall viability

The disadvantages of this option:

- The County purchases its service from an external provider, so a shared service option is not possible
- Consideration could be given to a joint contract, but the County costs are likely to be higher due to transport costs associated with a rural locality and a separate City contract is likely to be cheaper

4.1.4 **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 options for service users:

- Direct payments, so people can make their own arrangements
- Domiciliary care to heat or prepare a meal
- Support to order meals provision
- A managed service via the Council from a Framework Agreement (this would meet nutritional and quality standards)

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.

The advantages of this option:

- It offers customers choice and control
- It enables the Council to retain some control/responsibility for quality of provision (nutritionally and hygienically)
- It makes savings of approximately £213k
- It has limited financial or qualitative impacts on customers

The disadvantages of this option:

- A contract for these small numbers still requires procuring and monitoring
- Contracted services don't always offer sufficient flexibility e.g. in delivery times
- Potential for TUPE may limit the number of providers coming forward or increase the cost
- Costs may increase due to reduced numbers using the service

Option 4 is the recommended option.

4.1.5 **Option 5.** 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:

- 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

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.

The advantages of this option:

- It offers customers choice and control
- It enables the Council to fully implement the personalisation agenda by withdrawing from formalised contacting arrangements
- It requires less Council resource procuring and monitoring
- It makes savings of approximately £206k

The disadvantages of this option:

- Some customers may still not want a direct payment even if managed on their behalf
- The Council relinquishes control over quality and nutritional standards
- Costs for customers are likely to increase in “like for like” options as the Council will no longer be subsidising the service – however their needs can be met in other ways for a lower cost if they chose this
- Slightly lower estimated savings than option 4

4.2 Impacts

4.2.1 **Customer financial impacts.** The preferred option (option 4) will have different financial implications depending on people’s circumstances and what option they require going forward. The following assumptions have been made in order to estimate the likely impact of changes to services:

- For the customers who are expected to receive a replacement delivered meal, the assumption is that the charge from the Council will be at the current rate (£3.05 per meal). There will be no financial impact for these customers.
- For those customers who are expected to receive extended home care calls, 17% are likely make a contribution towards the service. The financial assessments undertaken for these customers show that the remaining 83% can either not afford to make a contribution or are already paying their maximum amount.
- For those customers who are expected to receive support to order food, this is assumed to be chargeable at the current home care rate of £12.45 per hour. Financial assessments undertaken for these customers indicate that around 42% of these customers are likely to make a contribution; the remaining 58% can either not afford to make a contribution or are already paying their maximum amount.

4.2.2 It is estimated that out of the 236 current mobile meals recipients 220 (93%) will pay no more than they do currently; 16 people (7%) are expected to pay more. This is based on applying assumptions about the future services that people will receive, along with information from financial assessments for the 70% who have had them.

4.2.3 Using information about the expected services that people will receive, and the outcomes of financial assessments already undertaken, it has been possible to estimate the additional future contributions as ranging from zero to £15.

Appendix 7 reflects this in further detail.

4.2.4 It should be noted that it is possible some people could pay more than £15 extra per week but this would be as a consequence of people who currently do not require home care receiving a half an hour home care call as a replacement service for each meal. In practice, this is an unlikely commissioning decision (unless someone's needs had increased in which case that isn't the impact of the review implementation but of changed personal circumstances) and it is more likely that a customer would request an alternative service to avoid such a charge.

4.2.5 It is also possible that some people may no longer require a meal following a reassessment. This could be due to them having only required the meal for a time limited period, or due to improved circumstances meaning they are no longer eligible for services. This will be subject to individual assessment.

4.2.6 In addition, there are people who may be better off as result of the change if option 4 was implemented, by purchasing the actual food themselves for less than £3.05 they currently pay towards a meal. This could apply if a person:

- Received no replacement service and instead sourced ready meals from a supermarket, then there is the possibility they could get these for less than the £3.05 they currently pay.
- Had frozen meals delivered by a supermarket (or a family member) and then received a home care call to reheat these, then they could save money by paying less than £3.05 for the frozen meal itself. (Any contribution towards the home care call would offset any savings for the individual, but based on current information we know most will not pay for the home care).

4.2.7 Where people take a direct payment they would effectively have £5.33 to purchase a meal (£2.28 direct payment amount plus £3.05 contribution). If they are able to arrange a delivered meal for less than this then they could free up money to meet other eligible needs. Appendix 8 shows case study impacts for service users.

4.3 Customer "other" impacts.

4.3.1 There is the potential for qualitative impacts for some customers. For those who currently get a fresh meal delivered (Gujarati or African/Caribbean meals) and also get domiciliary care a likely alternative option, would be for the care visit to be extended so that meal support can also be provided. In these cases, service users are likely to have a chilled or frozen meal reheated which they may perceive more negatively than when they had fresh provision. However, service users could choose a direct payment in order to continue the same meal type if it was preferable.

4.3.2 All customers will be reassessed and supported to find alternative options. It is possible that some will no longer be eligible and in this case people will be signposted to alternative options that people can organise themselves or with the support of family. Reassessments will also include an assessment of people's need for social interaction and ensure that need is met with appropriate

support planning.

4.3.3 **Workforce impacts.** This will be dependent on the option chosen, if the decision is to close the service then all posts would be deleted and post holders would be redundant. If it is one of the other options, there may be TUPE implications. See further information below on TUPE. These changes are likely to have an impact on employee relations and staff morale. See section 6.4 below for further detail.

4.3.4 **Provider impacts.** For both external providers, loss of a contract would have an impact on their viability and provision of other services. However, both responded to the soft market testing exercise and are potentially willing to continue to provide services privately or as part of a contracted service with the Council. Both currently have private customers and would also be looking to develop this area further. Internal provider impacts are covered in the workforce impacts above.

4.3.5 **Council financial impacts.** See section 6.1 below. In summary Option 4 will enable the Council to achieve approximately £213k savings per year based on current projections (please note these are only an estimate and final savings will be based on individual choices and options).

4.3.6 **Winter Pressures.** It has been suggested that the loss of the mobile meal service we currently commission will cut people off from contact with people who can check on wellbeing / raise an alarm. However, as every person who is requiring assistance will continue to receive it, this is not felt to be a risk. As this is a targeted service, like other ASC provision, it cannot substitute for citizenship, neighbourliness or family care and oversight of our older population.

4.3.7 **Equalities impacts.** See section 6.3 below. In summary, some service users may pay more in future, which impacts on older people and those with disabilities. Depending on meal type chosen, there may also be a disproportionate effect on those using a direct payment to purchase a fresh African/Caribbean meal or Kosher meal as these appear to be more expensive. At present this only affects a small number of people (twelve). If these users continued to have a meal from the Council framework this would be charged at a flat rate and the impact would be removed.

4.8 **Other impacts.**

4.8.1 The Council will need to ensure robust project planning so that during the transition no one “slips through the net”, that is to say that we ensure current customers are tracked and that a suitable alternative is in place before existing provision ceases. This will be part of the reassessment work stream. Where service users fall out of eligibility the Council needs to provide good reasons for the withdrawal and ensure an individual’s needs are not worsened by that withdrawal. Workers should also ensure they have information on appropriate alternatives.

4.8.2 There is a need to undertake a procurement exercise to ensure we have alternative hot meals provision. This will only be for a relatively small number of people. Therefore it is possible that economies of scale mean providers will not

be able to offer competitive pricing. However, indicative findings suggest this will not be the case. See the soft market testing at appendix 5 for more detailed information. Linked to this procurement is potential TUPE risk – highlighted in section 6.2.

5. Tell us how this issue has been externally scrutinised as well as internally?

5.1 ASC Leadership Team and the Assistant Mayor for ASC

5.2 The following stakeholders were also informed of the consultation with the opportunity to provide their views and those of the people they represent:

- Elected Members and Local Members of Parliament
- Trade Unions and staff at the in house service (transport and catering)
- The two external providers
- The general public via the Council website
- Forum for Older People
- The Carers Reference Group
- The 50+ Network
- Discuss (Disabled Customers Group)
- Leicester Centre for Integrated Living (LCIL)
- Age UK
- Alzheimer's Society
- Healthwatch

6. Financial, legal and other implications

6.1 Financial implications

6.1.1 The budgeted saving for the mobile meals service is £158k in 13/14, rising to £248k from 14/15 onwards.

6.1.2 Based on the forecast cost and number of meals, the average gross cost per meal for 13/14 is expected to be in the region of £8.70. Over the last 3 years the unit cost has increased by an average of 17% per annum. It is forecast that the unit cost could rise to around £12 over the next 3 years. Department of Health guidance (Fairer Charging) restricts the extent to which the charge to eligible customers could be raised to cover this increasing cost, since the charge can only 'substitute for ordinary living costs'.

6.1.3 Option 1 of doing nothing is not financially viable since it would lead to rising costs and not deliver against the savings target. It does not represent good value in meeting customer needs.

6.1.4 Under Option 2, if the number of meals being delivered could increase through selling to self-funders then the unit cost would fall. PSSRU (Personal Social Services Research Unit) has estimated that self-funders number around a third of the eligible customers supported by Local Authorities. Financial information in relation to Option 2 has been requested from Education and Children's Services

to establish the likely fall in unit costs, but at this stage it is considered unlikely to reduce significantly. This is because it would be necessary to charge self-funders a much higher rate (perhaps the full cost), which would be prohibitively expensive for many.

- 6.1.5 Under Option 3, the contractual arrangements of the County would need to be explored further to establish whether joint contracts could significantly reduce costs. Transport costs would likely be much higher in the County and the types of meal being delivered be less varied. This could increase the complexity of such a contractual arrangement, and reduce the potential savings.
- 6.1.6 Option 4 of contracting out the mobile meals service would lead to annual savings in the region of £213k. There would be additional costs incurred in terms of staff time spent on the procurement process and the on-going monitoring of contracts. The actual savings would be determined by the outcome of each assessment and the selection of any replacement services.
- 6.1.7 Option 5, involving an increased use of managed direct payments to meet people's needs would lead to annual savings in the region of £206k. As with Option 4, the actual savings would be determined by the outcome of each assessment and the selection of replacement services by each customer.
- 6.1.8 The savings for all options shown above are against the full current cost of providing the service, including van leasing costs. Edward Street Kitchens, where some meals are currently re-heated, had a cleared-site valuation of £130k in 2011. Those options which would lead to the closure of these kitchens (options 3, 4 and 5) could therefore result in an additional one-off capital receipt of this amount.

Stuart McAvoy - Adult Social Care Accountant

6.2 Legal implications

6.2.1 Community Care Law

Legal advice has been sought on the implications for service users from a Community Care Law perspective and consideration needs to be given to the Council's public law duties under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 when undertaking assessments of need and considering suitable alternative provisions for service users subject to their individual needs. The Local Authority also must bear in mind its legal obligations as prescribed under section 117 of the Mental Health Act 1983 which provides for provisions without charge to the service user, Sections 2 (1) (a), 2 (1) € and 2 (1)(g) under the Chronically Sick and Disabled Act 1970 in respect of the provision of meals for disabled persons and the Health Service and Public Health Act 1968 section 45 (DHSS circular 19/71) which makes provision for meals and recreation in the home or elsewhere for elderly persons. A failure to adhere to these duties could result in a legal challenge by way of judicial review.

Legal advice should continue to be obtained as and when necessary.

Pretty Patel - Principal Lawyer, Social Care and Safeguarding

6.2.2 TUPE Implications

All five options proposed are likely to result in employment law implications either by way of changes to terms and conditions, redundancy and/ or transfers of staff either in or out of the Council under the transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) (“TUPE”) Regulations 2006.

It is advised that Legal Services are consulted throughout to ensure that the Council complies with its legal obligations and to ensure that the risk of claims is minimised.

Hayley McDade, City Barrister

6.2.3 Contracts Law

The conflicting consideration with public procurement law is in respect of the statutory Best Value Guidance 2011 and the public law duties in accordance with S149 as mentioned by my work colleague above. This impacts upon the reduction or cessation of services as per the recommended Option 4. Not complying with these obligations will place the Council at a high risk of a public law challenge. I understand the first part of the consultation process has already been concluded.

If it is agreed to implement Option 4 then, the client must serve 12 weeks’ written notice to terminate the Service, to continue with the application of the Best Value Statutory Guidance. This notice period is not aligned in the original contracts signed back in 2009.

Nimisha Ruparelia - Commercial Contracts Solicitor

6.3 Equalities Implications

6.3.1 the current 236 users of the mobile meals service, the main relevant protected characteristics influencing their needs are age, disability, race, religion and belief, and gender. Over the past few years users of the service have increasingly chosen to leave the service and source their meal requirements in other ways. The remaining users have expressed a range of concerns about potentially negative impacts that ending the current service will have: loss of social contact; concern about continuing to have their nutritional and cultural/religious food needs met to the same level; and continued provision of a hot meal. The recommended proposal aims to address these negative impacts through a range of mitigating actions that will enable the service user to choose the most appropriate options for themselves which best meets their meal needs and suits their practical arrangements.

Irene Kszyk - Corporate Equalities Lead

6.4 HR Implications

- 6.4.1 If the proposal is approved there will be 19 staff (8.93 FTE) that would be affected. There will be no requirement for redundancy selection as it is proposed that all City Council posts involved in the mobile meals service are to be deleted and therefore the post holders would be compulsorily redundant.
- 6.4.2 It is envisaged that there may be a possibility to offer the catering staff suitable alternative employment within the schools catering service. Similarly there may be suitable vacancies in PATS which may be offered as suitable alternative employment. It is also proposed that voluntary redundancy will be offered within the PATS service area that could be considered as a release for “bump-on” if there are no vacancies available.
- 6.4.3 If the proposal is approved and failing the above strategies, qualifying affected employees will be placed on the redeployment list. This will afford them the support of a redeployment officer who will assist them to apply for suitable alternative employment and offer guidance around redundancy payments and rights if applicable. They will also be offered support through the Council’s outplacement service and AMICA.
- 6.4.4 Following the consultation process, if the proposal is approved, staff that do not secure alternative employment either in the same service or through redeployment will be identified as redundant. Any subsequent dismissals would be on the grounds of redundancy with the required notice period.
- 6.4.5 Any dismissals will be effected by the issue of notice of termination giving the relevant statutory or contractual notice period, whichever is greater.

Jagruti Barai – HR Advisor

7. Background information and other papers:

4th October 2012 Future of Mobile Meals executive report

8. Summary of appendices:

Appendix 1 Consultation approach

Appendix 2 Staff feedback

Appendix 3 Union feedback

Appendix 4 Consultation findings

Appendix 5 Soft Market Testing

Appendix 6 Equality Impact Assessment

Appendix 7 Financial analysis

Appendix 8 Customer Scenarios

9. Is this a confidential report (If so, please indicated the reasons and state why it is not in the public interest to be dealt with publicly)?

No

10. Is this a “key decision”?

Yes