



WALES AUDIT OFFICE  
SWYDDFA ARCHWILIO CYMRU

Archwilydd Cyffredinol Cymru  
Auditor General for Wales

# Review of the Gwent Frailty Programme: Phase Two – **Aneurin Bevan University Health Board, Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council, Caerphilly County Borough Council, Monmouthshire County Council, Newport City Council, Torfaen County Borough Council**

Audit year: 2014-15

Date issued: October 2016

Document reference: 504A2015



This document has been prepared as part of work performed in accordance with statutory functions.

In the event of receiving a request for information to which this document may be relevant, attention is drawn to the Code of Practice issued under section 45 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The section 45 code sets out the practice in the handling of requests that is expected of public authorities, including consultation with relevant third parties. In relation to this document, the Auditor General for Wales and the Wales Audit Office are relevant third parties. Any enquiries regarding

disclosure or re-use of this document should be sent to the Wales Audit Office at

[info.officer@audit.wales](mailto:info.officer@audit.wales).

# Contents

The Programme has demonstrated positive regional cross-sector partnership working to tackle growing community-based needs, but it has not evidenced tangible improved outcomes, which will be important as partners determine their vision for the future of the programme.

## Summary report

Background	4
Proposals for improvement	6

## Detailed report

The Gwent Frailty Programme successfully brought together partners who invested time and resources to improve outcomes for frail elderly people, but the financial aims were not achieved, and outcomes remain difficult for partners to evidence	7
---	---

Governance arrangements over the lifetime of the programme have been generally adequate but the Programme could have engaged partners better, benefited from clearer information and been more open about its business	8
--	---

The Gwent Frailty Programme benefits from strong commitment and is at a pivotal point in its journey but needs clarity of vision to succeed	12
---	----

## Appendices

Summary of core reporting	14
Decision tracker	16
Organisation-specific information	20
Management response	26

# Summary report

## Background

- 1 From April 2011, Aneurin Bevan University Health Board (the Health Board) and Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, Monmouthshire, Newport and Torfaen Councils began implementing an ambitious integrated model of care called the Gwent Frailty Programme (the Programme)<sup>1</sup>. The Programme was funded by a Welsh Government Invest to Save loan and contributions from respective partners to create a pooled fund.
- 2 The Programme has legal status under a Section 33 partnership agreement<sup>2</sup> between the Health Board and the five Gwent councils. The agreement ran for three years commencing in April 2011. A Gwent Frailty Joint Committee (GFJC) was created as a decision-making body holding formal accountability under the Section 33 agreement. An Operational Co-ordinating Group (OCG), a range of specialist sub-groups and local implementation structures also supported the work of the Frailty Programme Joint Committee<sup>3</sup>.
- 3 In November 2012, a Wales Audit Office review of the Programme found that partners were strongly committed to the Gwent Frailty vision and had created a sound programme management framework to underpin it. It recognised that the Programme was in the early stages of implementation and it faced challenges to ensure the Programme was sustainable, to change established working practices and to demonstrate its impact.
- 4 This latest review was undertaken by staff of the Wales Audit Office on behalf of the Auditor General. This review focuses on the accountability of the GFJC; firstly to individual partner organisations and secondly to the Welsh Government to test whether the expectations of partner organisations have been met.
- 5 Our review considered whether the Gwent Frailty Programme has delivered improvements in line with individual organisations' expectations and in particular:
  - Is it clear how expectations of the individual organisations were delivered through the Programme?
  - Did the Programme demonstrate effective governance?

<sup>1</sup> Unless stated otherwise, the 'Programme' covers the committees and working groups, members and staff and the overall delivery and service model.

<sup>2</sup> The Section 33 agreement provides a formal basis for partnership working. The partners can employ a Section 33 agreement as a mechanism to create pooled revenue and capital funding. The host's financial management and financial accounting rules apply. This means that the joint service can reclaim VAT as well as utilising other financial flexibilities available to local government bodies.

<sup>3</sup> For the purposes of this report, reference to Programme Committees covers the Gwent Frailty Joint Committee, Operational Co-ordinating Group, the range of specialist sub-groups and local implementation structures.

- Is the future direction of the Programme clear and agreed?

6 We concluded that **the Programme has demonstrated positive regional cross-sector partnership working to tackle growing community-based needs, but it has not evidenced tangible improved outcomes, which will be important as partners determine the future of the programme.**

7 We reached this conclusion because:

- The Gwent Frailty Programme successfully brought together partners who invested time and resources to improve outcomes for frail elderly people, but the financial aims were not achieved, and outcomes remain difficult for partners to evidence.
- Governance arrangements over the lifetime of the programme have been generally adequate but the Programme could have engaged partners better, benefited from clearer information and been more open about its business. We found that:
  - the governance arrangements provided for timely decision-making but partner organisations were not always kept adequately informed of important issues affecting the Programme, such as the emerging large underspend;
  - financial reporting arrangements within the Programme were adequate but performance reporting was not fit for purpose;
  - public transparency and decision recording started well but became weaker over time; and
  - routine scrutiny of decisions by the GFJC was not robust, although, most partners reported annually through their own scrutiny arrangements.
- The Gwent Frailty Programme benefits from strong commitment and is at a pivotal point in its journey, but needs clarity of vision to succeed. We found that:
  - the Programme has benefited from a strong commitment from the partner organisations; this needs to be re-confirmed in the context of the financial and operational challenges facing the individual organisations; and
  - the future direction of the Programme is unclear, the partnership is at a pivotal point and partners are yet to agree a clear vision, which will need measurable outcomes and benefits.

# Proposals for improvement

## Exhibit 1: Proposals for improvement

Exhibit 1 shows a table of the proposals for improvement that Wales Audit Office has made as a result of undertaking this review.

Proposals for improvement	
R1	Ensure that commitment to the future of the Programme is obtained from partner organisations and clearly expressed through the Section 33 agreement.
R2	Ensure that the Section 33 agreement is supported by clear measurable aims and targets.
P3	Develop a performance management framework to ensure that the success of the programme can be clearly evidenced and provides a mechanism to hold localities to account.
P4	Ensure that governance arrangements include effective scrutiny of the programme as a whole and engage partner organisations as appropriate.
P5	Ensure that the recording of decisions is consistent and maintained in a log, and that the activities of the programme are publicly available and easily accessible.

# Detailed report

## The Gwent Frailty Programme successfully brought together partners who invested time and resources to improve outcomes for frail elderly people, but the financial aims were not achieved, and outcomes remain difficult for partners to evidence

- 8 The Gwent Frailty Programme has been successful in bringing the five councils and the local Health Board together to address frailty in a co-ordinated way. For example, the programme has created integrated working and community resource teams to help deliver services that are effective and efficient in supporting frail people in the community. Partners are positive about the approach and have a shared perception of improved outcomes. Councils reported that demand for residential care places in their localities was reducing, which they believe was as a result of the Programme, and partners generally provided case histories of improved outcomes for many older people living within each of the five localities.
- 9 The business case was agreed in 2011 by the partners and clearly set out their expectations and planned outcomes from the Gwent Frailty Programme. The business case secured a Welsh Government 'Invest to Save' loan of £7.3 million. This loan was repayable over five years to the Welsh Government using expected savings as set out in the business case. The business case identified savings that would be achieved through bed closures in the Health Board, and a reduction in complex care packages and less demand for residential care placements funded by the councils. Partners were clear at the outset about how the Programme would be funded and agreed to a formula for contributing to different elements of it and repayment of the loan.
- 10 The planned financial savings have not been realised and were acknowledged by partners, in hindsight, to be overly optimistic. The anticipated reduction in bed numbers was a key factor in securing commitment from partners and securing the Invest to Save loan. Partners have not been able to achieve the planned level of savings, and the repayment continues to be funded by the Health Board and councils' core budgets.
- 11 Partners did not clearly demonstrate the overall achievements of the Gwent Frailty Programme against its original objectives when reporting to the Welsh Government in 2014. Partners could show the numbers of patients using the service and to some extent the individual outcomes. These key performance indicators had been in place since inception, and aspects such as patient case mix and length of stay were available. However, partnership outcome measures were not available for all aspects of the project and the impact of demographic changes on demand for services had not been adequately anticipated by partners, which affected the ability of partners to show achievement against the original aims.

**Governance arrangements over the lifetime of the Programme have been generally adequate but the Programme could have engaged partners better, benefited from clearer information and been more open about its business**

**The governance arrangements provided for timely decision-making but partner organisations were not always kept adequately informed of important issues affecting the Programme, such as the emerging large underspend**

- 12 Individual partners demonstrated clear commitment to the Programme through the establishment of the Section 33 agreement. The Councils' overview and scrutiny committees considered the draft Gwent Frailty Programme Section 33 agreement prior to approval by Executive Committees during the spring of 2011. Similarly, the Health Board also considered the draft agreement and committed to the Programme.
- 13 The governance arrangements for the Programme Committees were clear. The Section 33 agreement set out how decisions would be made and how the programme would manage its finances. For example: it described the arrangements in the event of underspends and overspends; defined arrangements if any partner wished to leave the Programme; and defined the role of Caerphilly County Borough Council as lead commissioning body. The Section 33 agreement facilitated timely operational decision-making within the Programme to ensure that decisions could be made by partner representatives on Programme Committees without the need to refer back through their own organisations' governance arrangements. This agreed arrangement significantly reduced what could have been a very drawn-out decision making process.
- 14 Whilst this approach provided for timely decision-making, the Programme did not adequately consider how to communicate decisions made by the GFJC back to the individual partner agencies. One example was the decision not to adopt a common service model, although this was originally a fundamental principle of the Programme. Another was changes to the financial arrangements because of savings not being achieved and delays in recruitment that significantly affected workforce plans and the move towards a common model. These decisions resulted in a significant unplanned underspend and the model not being implemented fully in all localities.



- 15 Although the governance arrangements were designed to facilitate speedy decision-making, the hiatus resulting from a lengthy independent review of the Programme meant that:
- some localities' implementation of the 'preferred model' was delayed or only partially implemented;
  - clarity around the ongoing viability of the Programme has not ensured a smooth and timely transition from the original project to its possible successor; and
  - there was some uncertainty at a time when partners are making difficult decisions in the light of austerity measures.
- 16 Routine monitoring, by partner organisations, of the Gwent Frailty Programme was variable. Consistent and comprehensive formal reporting mechanisms were not put in place to ensure each partner organisation was kept adequately informed. Instead, members of the programme and senior managers determined their own way to report decisions taken by the GFJC, which were predominately through line management arrangements rather than any formal reporting of specific reports and minutes of meetings. For example: Newport City Council took reports to Cabinet in 2011 and 2012 but nothing after this; Torfaen County Borough Council included the Gwent Frailty Programme in its quarterly update on Collaborative activity, which was received by all Scrutiny and Overview committees; whilst others councils received an annual report to their Overview and Scrutiny committees (see [Appendix 1](#) for further details).

## Financial reporting arrangements within the Programme were adequate but performance reporting was not fit for purpose

- 17 The GFJC received regular reports on financial monitoring but key messages within reports were not always clear due to the complexity of funding and evolution of the business model. Monthly reports were produced by the Programme's OCG finance work-stream. Overall, the reports contained all the relevant information necessary for members to make informed decisions but there were some concerns that they did not highlight the important issues. The quality of the financial decision-making could have been improved by clearer and succinct reports. Longstanding and unresolved delays in recruitment significantly affected the budget profiles in the financial reports which, at times, made them complex to prepare, needed regular updating and proved difficult for some decision-makers to fully understand why changes had occurred.
- 18 The Gwent Frailty Programme was not able to demonstrate achievements against planned expectations in the business case because of a lack of robust performance management arrangements. Some partners found it difficult to develop adequate measures which would enable stakeholders to determine if the objectives of the Programme were being delivered. Partners are now developing a

more robust outcome framework in anticipation of the Programme continuing and the need to demonstrate outcomes from further investment. Overall, other reports to the GFJC were adequate and provided in a timely manner.

## Public transparency and decision recording started well but became weaker over time

- 19 All members of the GFJC were senior members of their respective organisations. They all acted within their delegated powers and made decisions within the remit set out in the Section 33 agreement and in their own organisation's scheme of delegation. Examples in [Appendix 2](#) highlight two key decisions taken and demonstrate how these were within the governance framework.
- 20 Decisions taken by the GFJC were not consistently accessible to the public in the later stages of the Programme, although in the early stages, they were widely communicated. Minutes of meetings did not consistently provide a clear record, nor was there a log of decisions made. Clear records of decision making would have aided understanding of the progress of the Programme and the challenges it faced. Until 2013, the minutes of the GFJC were posted on a dedicated Gwent Frailty website hosted by the Health Board, which communicated the vision of the Programme and progress. The Operating and Co-ordinating Group decided to discontinue support of the Gwent Frailty website in 2013. No alternative was established to ensure that the minutes were easily available to the public. Therefore, minutes were only available to those directly involved in the Gwent Programme or on request.

## Routine scrutiny of decisions by the GFJC was not robust, although, most partners reported annually through their own scrutiny arrangements

- 21 The Programme's governance framework did not include an effective dedicated scrutiny function, so decisions taken by the GFJC went largely unchallenged and did not benefit from close independent scrutiny. Whilst partners reported within their own governance structures such as to Scrutiny and Audit Committees, the programme itself was not effectively scrutinised.
- 22 We found examples where in our view there were some significant departures from the original plan that would have benefited from wider discussion amongst the partners. This wider discussion would have ensured understanding, commitment and agreement to revisions of the plan. Although we note that the GFJC, acting within its authority, made key decisions, partners were not given the opportunity to influence these decisions. For example, by the end of 2013, the Gwent Frailty Programme was underspent by approximately £2 million because of recruitment difficulties and an earlier decision to temporarily freeze recruitment. The GFJC later

decided not to draw down further from the Invest to Save loan from the Welsh Government. This left a residual £1 million allocated to the Programme unspent and affected the pace of delivery of the programme staffing model and services in some localities. These are key decisions that we believe partner organisations should have been made aware of and for which they may have wanted to be party to the decision-making process.

- 23 The original financial plan was shared and agreed with partners at the commencement of the Section 33 agreement in 2011. However, the revisions to the financial plan had not been shared other than those directly involved in the programme. Partners received regular reports of financial progress through their budget monitoring arrangements. However, these reports did not always show the overall financial position of the Programme or, for example, the escalating underspend owing to the recruitment challenges and decision to pause the continued rollout of the Programme across all localities.
- 24 Some councils were more proactive than others at keeping their organisations informed, for example, by holding joint Overview and Scrutiny committees to examine frailty as a crosscutting issue and holding seminars to help members understand the issues being addressed by the Gwent Frailty Programme. Overall, the partners received information in different ways, at different times, with different frequency. Reports, in the main, focused on the implications for their own organisation in order to comply with their own governance responsibilities and not the progress of the Programme as a whole.
- 25 The Programme received some external challenge, firstly from the Wales Audit Office in 2012 and more recently when the Gwent Frailty Programme commissioned a review from an external consultant that reported in September 2014. Both these reviews and their subsequent action plans were reported to the Gwent GFJC and through individual partner organisations. These reviews provided an external perspective, but neither did, nor could have, influenced decision making in a way which would replace the need for effective scrutiny.
- 26 Over the last year, there have been some positive signs that partners have updated their organisations of the current position in respect of the Programme. For example, since the publication of the external consultant's report, the GFJC, and each of the individual partners, have used the report to inform scrutiny and to support strategic decision making on the scope of the service going forward. This process has, however, taken time.

## The Gwent Frailty Programme benefits from strong commitment and is at a pivotal point in its journey but needs clarity of vision to succeed

The Programme has benefited from a strong commitment from the partner organisations; this needs to be re-confirmed in the context of the financial and operational challenges facing the individual organisations

- 27 The Gwent Frailty Programme has strong commitment by those directly involved in the Programme and they are keen to maintain the current momentum in terms of a common understanding of the needs of frail elderly residents and the benefits of the Gwent Frailty model.
- 28 The Section 33 agreement was open ended, although the initial period relating to the Invest to Save funding was only for three years. Upon reaching the end of the three-year period, partners had not sought formal approval from partner organisations for any extension. However, the GFJC itself agreed in 2014 to roll it over for one more year. The decision on the future of the Programme would have benefited from an earlier debate on the future direction of the Programme within the context of financial constraints, public-sector reform and future potential scope of programme services.
- As a consequence, there is no formal agreement by each of the partners regarding:
- managing the pooled fund, which currently stands at approximately £6 million and covers the ongoing service costs;
  - the funding of existing and future service costs in each of the localities; and
  - the contribution from all partners for central support and programme co-ordination.
- 29 The £5 million of the Invest to Save loan will no longer be repaid as planned through savings, therefore the responsibility has fallen to individual partner organisations and will be funded from their core budgets in different proportions, with the biggest part falling to the Health Board. The Welsh Government has agreed to extend the repayment period. Whilst partners welcome this because it reduces the annual repayment amounts, it places a longer than originally planned financial burden on the partners at a time when the effects of austerity measures are being felt.
- 30 Operational challenges continue. Recruitment difficulties experienced already may still hamper service delivery and progress towards a common model. Financial pressures across public services could directly or indirectly impact on the demand and delivery of the Programme objectives. Financial savings requirements in the

partner organisations could also put significant pressure on service delivery resources. The progress achieved so far could be undermined and is at risk.

**The future direction of the Programme is unclear, the partnership is at a pivotal point and partners are yet to agree a clear vision which will need measurable outcomes and benefits**

- 31 The programme has taken positive action to strengthen Gwent-wide operational leadership and co-ordination. The consultant's report in 2014 recommended the appointment of a programme director. The GFJC agreed to fund this dedicated post for an initial 18-month period, which is intended to provide co-ordinated strategic leadership for the Programme as a whole. Funding this post demonstrates a willingness to strengthen the Programme's delivery arrangements and shows continued commitment from all partners.
- 32 Partners are now actively engaged in planning for the future. Senior managers were developing a new business case, which was scheduled for consideration by the GFJC by July 2015. The Programme already has in place its 2015-16 financial plan and partners are developing indicative budgets for 2016-17 that will be incorporated within a new Section 33 agreement. These plans and the agreement will need to take account of the local and national context of austerity, public-sector reform, changes to population demographics and demand for services. Aims and objectives will need to be clearly stated within the agreement.
- 33 At the time of our review, councils and the Health Board are currently considering their future options for the Programme including a new Section 33 agreement. In doing so, partners will need to take account of their experiences to date and lessons learnt from the Programme such as effective scrutiny, financial reporting and performance management.

# Appendix 1

## Summary of core reporting

### Exhibit 2: Summary of core reporting

Exhibit 2 shows a table of the frequency that information is shared from the Gwent frailty partnership back to the individual partner organisation's executive, cabinet or scrutiny committee.

	Newport	Monmouthshire	Torfaen	Blaenau Gwent	Caerphilly	Aneurin Bevan UHB
Minutes of GFJC meetings	Not distributed beyond Programme	Not distributed beyond Programme	Not distributed beyond Programme	Not distributed beyond Programme	Not distributed beyond Programme	Not distributed beyond Programme
Reports to Cabinet or Health Board Executive	Section 33 agreement 2011 July 2011 February 2012 October 2012 March 2013	Section 33 agreement 2011	Section 33 agreement 2011	Section 33 agreement 2011  January 2011 March 2011 November 2014	Section 33 agreement 2011  Inclusion in Budget reports for finance issues	Exec Board 2011  January 2012 March 2013 (CHC review) May 2014

	Newport	Monmouthshire	Torfaen	Blaenau Gwent	Caerphilly	Aneurin Bevan UHB
Overview and Scrutiny Seminars	August 2011 November 2011 January 2012 March 2013 April 2013 October 2013 March 2015	March 2011 March 2012 April 2013 November 2014	November 2011 March 2012 November 2012 Plus inclusion in a collaboration report that goes to all scrutiny committees	April 2011 January 2014 October 2014	February 2013 October 2014	Not relevant
Audit Committee			September 2012 December 2012 December 2013 February 2014 June 2014 September 2014 March 2015		March 2013	June 2011 October 2012 April 2013 October 2014 February 2015
Health Committees	Not relevant	Not relevant	Not relevant	Not relevant	Not relevant	July 2011 Public Health and Partnerships
Other				October 2014 Corporate Management		

# Appendix 2

## Decision tracker

### Exhibit 3: Decision tracker

Exhibit 3 shows the extent to which the key decisions made by the committee were communicated to and considered by the individual partner organisations.

Decision: Freeze on recruitment	
<b>Context</b>	<p>The GFJC agreed locality plans which set out the staffing requirements to move each locality from their starting point towards a common model as set out in the original business case. The Programme experienced long delays to recruit staff because of delays in obtaining employment checks, medical clearance and lengthy HR processes. The GFJC discussed the impact of these delays at many meetings, and minutes record frustration and the constant need to re-profile budgets. By <b>September 2013</b>, the inability to overcome the obstacles despite efforts from the GFJC members resulted in an accumulated underspend in excess of £2 million. Partners also agreed to commission an external evaluation to re-assess plans set out in the original business case.</p> <p>The underspend was shown within each of the first two Memorandum Accounts of the Section 33 agreement and these were submitted to the Welsh Government. The GFJC was also conscious that projected savings were not being achieved as quickly as anticipated and any further draw down of the loan would only increase the cost pressure associated with its repayment.</p>
<b>Decision</b>	<p>The GFJC decided to freeze recruitment of the professional staff that would have been funded from year three of the Invest to Save loan and adjust the original recruitment projections across the Programme.</p>



<b>Decision: Freeze on recruitment</b>	
<b>Scheme of Delegation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Budget Provision:</b> To approve annual estimates for each Locality, Lead Commissioner and Central Costs including variations to budgets in accordance with financial regulations and affordability.</li> <li>• <b>Staff Structures:</b> To approve staff structures for each locality and the lead commissioner. To cover base budget and including substantive changes to those structures.</li> <li>• <b>Financial Management:</b> To review financial progress based on quarterly reports from the pooled fund manager.</li> <li>• <b>Service Provision:</b> To review and agree to introduction of new adjustments to existing, or withdrawal of Frailty service provision, within any locality.</li> </ul>
<b>Decision: Freeze on recruitment of professional staff scheduled for year three of Invest to Save loan</b>	
<b>Impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme incurred an underspend of £1 million of the Invest to Save loan available to pump prime a common franchise model of care.</li> <li>• No further increase in staffing structures for localities.</li> <li>• All locality plans readjusted to roll over remaining year-two appointments that were still delayed but a total freeze on any new posts for the Programme.</li> <li>• No further locality plans produced after 2013 used as the main vehicle for administering the loan.</li> <li>• No further drawdown of the Invest to Save loan.</li> </ul>
<b>Evidence of decision formally reported to Partners</b>	<p>Minutes and records of this decision not publicly available or distributed within partner organisations.</p> <p><b>Examples of formal reporting supplied during review corresponding to this time scale:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newport – Scrutiny committee in October 2013 but this focused on Cordis Bright report.</li> <li>• Monmouthshire – Scrutiny committee received a report on Frailty but not until November 2014.</li> <li>• Torfaen – Recruitment delays reported in a PowerPoint slide as part of a member seminar in November 2013.</li> <li>• Caerphilly – Scrutiny report in October 2014 but focus was the Wales Audit Office action plan and report.</li> <li>• Blaenau Gwent – Scrutiny report October 2014 but the main focus was the Cordis Bright review.</li> <li>• Aneurin Bevan UHB – No specific report identified to track communication of this decision.</li> </ul>

Decision: Revised repayment schedule for the Invest to Save Loan and no further draw down of funds	
<b>Context</b>	<p>The Section 33 loan set out a repayment schedule of £0.37 million in 2012-13; £1 million in 2013-14; £1.5 million in 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17, with a final payment of £1.439 million in 2017-18. In September 2014, the GFJC discussed with colleagues from the Welsh Government progress against the Invest to Save loan. Members of the GFJC requested that the Welsh Government write off the loan but instead, in November 2014, the Programme was offered a longer repayment period. A financial strategy paper setting out three options for repayment and management of the pooled fund was considered by the GFJC. Detailed presentations helped to inform the decision, which included a paper on cost avoidance, potential savings release. Finance officers proposed three options for the GFJC to consider. Options were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• limit agreed expenditure to the minimum to maintain current structures with no further drawn down on loan and extension by two years to repay the loan;</li> <li>• limit expenditure to 2014-15 levels; or</li> <li>• extend investment to include year-2 posts and essential posts deemed necessary to go forward.</li> </ul>
<b>Decision</b>	November 2014: The GFJC decided unanimously to take option one.
<b>Scheme of Delegation</b>	<p><b>Financial Management:</b> To review financial progress based on quarterly reports from the Pooled Fund Manager.</p> <p><b>Invest to Save and Benefits Realisation.</b> To monitor the above and ensure agreed targets are being met. This will involve reviewing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that additional expenditure is in line with declarations, and agreed referral activity is being achieved;</li> <li>• to review benefits realisation (savings targets) are being delivered; and</li> <li>• to ensure that the Invest to Save payments are being made.</li> </ul>

<b>Decision: Revised repayment schedule for the Invest to Save Loan and no further drawn down of funds</b>	
<b>Impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further drawdown of loan – £1 million of available loan remained unallocated setting final drawdown of £6 million.</li> <li>• Additional two years to repay the loan, taking commitments to 2020-21.</li> </ul>
<b>Evidence of decision formally reported to Partners</b>	<p>Minutes and records of this decision not publicly available.</p> <p>We found no direct evidence of formal reporting of this decision back to any committees within partners' organisations. Colleagues reported that the repayment schedule would be reflected in future budget plans and the financial plan for the Programme.</p>

# Appendix 3

## Organisation-specific information

### Exhibit 4: Organisation-specific information

Exhibit 4 shows tables that provide contextual information on the role and function of each individual partner in the overall partnership.

<b>Aneurin Bevan University Health Board</b>
<b>Role in the programme</b>
Commissioner in programme with Caerphilly.
<b>Information reported back to partner organisation's scrutiny and committees</b>
Annual financial management and budgetary updates to Audit Committee. External review reports to Audit Committee. Workforce and recruitment update to Workforce and Organisation Development Committee. Frailty performance key messages report. Facilitated Executive Team seminar on results of External Review of Programme in August 2014. Periodic Executive Team reports on frailty operational issues. Annual progress reports to the Executive Team.
<b>Key observations</b>
Seminar for Board Members on the outcome of the external consultant's report.

**Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council****Role in the programme**

Local Authority Partner  
Chair of Operational Co-ordinating Group

**Information reported back to partner organisation's scrutiny and committees**

Consultant's report to Executive Team.  
Consultant's report to Social Care and Inclusion Scrutiny Committee.  
Report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee (2011 and 2014).  
Periodic budget updates to Executive.  
Progress report to senior management team (2011 and 2014).

**Caerphilly County Borough Council****Role in the programme**

Lead commissioner for the Programme  
Section 33 commissioning authority and host body  
Financial administrators

**Information reported back to partner organisation's scrutiny and committees**

Finance reports to Finance committee.  
Consultant's report to Health, Social Care and Wellbeing Scrutiny committee.  
External review (Wales Audit Office) report to Audit Committee.

<b>Monmouthshire County Council</b>
<b>Role in the programme</b>
Chair of GFJC
<b>Information reported back to partner organisation's scrutiny and committees</b>
Annual progress reports on development of frailty service to Adult Select Committee.

<b>Newport City Council</b>
<b>Role in the programme</b>
Local Authority partner
<b>Information reported back to partner organisation's scrutiny and committees</b>
<p>Biannual reports on the Programme to Executive until 2012 and then annually.</p> <p>Biannual reports to Housing and Community Services and Overview Committee until 2013 and then annually.</p> <p>Consultant's report to Executive and Community Planning and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>Budget reports to Finance Committee.</p> <p>Annual reports to Community Planning and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p>



<b>Torfaen County Borough Council</b>
<b>Role in the programme</b>
Local Authority Partner
<b>Information reported back to partner organisation's scrutiny and committees</b>
<p>Biannual reporting to Healthier Overview and Scrutiny committee.  Quarterly reports included within a Collaboration report.  Member seminars for all councillors (November 2013 and April 2015).  Regular reports to Audit Committee (three times in 2014).</p>
<b>Key observations</b>
<p>Collaboration report for all scrutiny committees in Torfaen to scrutinise engagement on external partnerships.  Proactive engagement of Scrutiny throughout the Programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Torfaen County Borough Council held an elected member seminar in April 2015 to raise awareness of progress of the Programme.</li> <li>• Torfaen County Borough Council produces a collaboration report that goes to all elected members on every Scrutiny Committee and this initiative provides regular updates on the Programme.</li> </ul>

# Appendix 4

## Management response

### Exhibit 5: Management response

Exhibit 5 provides a management response to the proposals for improvement as a result of this audit.

Ref	Proposal for Improvement	Intended outcome/benefit	High priority	Accepted	Management response	Completion date	Responsible officer
P1	Ensure that commitment to the future of the Programme is obtained from partner organisations and clearly expressed through the section 33 agreement.	Partner organisations retain a structured overview of delivery of intended outcomes from the Programme and have an opportunity to influence key decisions in relation to resources and future direction.	Yes	Yes	<p>A new Section 33 agreement covering a 5 year period has been drafted for discussion and sign off at the February GFJC. This agreement will be taken through the relevant Scrutiny Committees and Cabinets of all Local Authorities and ABUHB to ensure all partner organisations are committed to the future of the programme.</p> <p>The new Section 33 has been approved by the 5 Local Authorities and ABUHB, and is currently going through the Health Board's legal department for official ratification.</p>	February 2016	Joint Committee

Ref	Proposal for Improvement	Intended outcome/benefit	High priority	Accepted	Management response	Completion date	Responsible officer
P2	Ensure that the Section 33 agreement is supported by clear measurable aims and targets.	Partners will be able to clearly evidence delivery of intended outcomes.	Yes	Yes	<p>The overall aims, benefits and outcomes of the programme are identified in Section 5 of the Section 33. There is an ongoing workstream to revise the current Frailty KPIs that will better suit the intended outcomes.</p> <p>A new performance dashboard has been developed with more meaningful KPIs that relate specifically to the services, opposed to the financial driven targets that related to bed days.</p>	February 2016	Directors

Ref	Proposal for Improvement	Intended outcome/benefit	High priority	Accepted	Management response	Completion date	Responsible officer
P3	Develop a performance management framework to ensure that the success of the Programme can be clearly evidenced and provides a mechanism to hold localities to account.	Systems will be in place to enable partners to measure performance and take corrective action as necessary.		Yes	New KPIs are being developed to measure future outcomes for the GFP. These will be used to monitor the direction of the programme and to escalate any concerns to the GFJC accordingly.  The new draft performance report was received positively by OCG with a few minor amendments. It will be submitted to the GFJC in October for final sign off.	June 2016	Daniel Clarke
P4	Ensure that governance arrangements include effective scrutiny of the Programme as a whole and engage partner organisations as appropriate.	The partnership is subject to routine scrutiny and challenge to improve the quality of decision-making.		Yes	In the new Section 33 there is a revised governance and reporting structure in schedule 2. Para 13.9 states scrutiny arrangements will be in accordance with each organisation's constitutional framework.  In addition, an annual report has been produced and circulated to the partnership organisations, with a view of it being available in the public domain.	September 2016	Directors

Ref	Proposal for Improvement	Intended outcome/benefit	High priority	Accepted	Management response	Completion date	Responsible officer
P5	Ensure that the recording of decisions is consistent and maintained in a log, and that the activities of the Programme are publicly available and easily accessible.	Members of the public, partner organisations and other stakeholders will have access to information showing progress of the partnership to increase transparency.		Yes	A decisions and actions log is to be developed to support the minutes. This will be encompassed in the papers for the GFJC and circulated accordingly. An action log has been developed and is circulated with the papers for the GFJC and OCG.	TBC (awaiting confirmation from LA colleagues on how this will be managed in the public domain)	Daniel Clarke

Wales Audit Office  
24 Cathedral Road  
Cardiff CF11 9LJ

Tel: 029 2032 0500

Fax: 029 2032 0600

Textphone : 029 2032 0660

E-mail: [info@audit.wales](mailto:info@audit.wales)

Website: [www.audit.wales](http://www.audit.wales)

Swyddfa Archwilio Cymru  
24 Heol y Gadeirlan  
Caerdydd CF11 9LJ

Ffôn: 029 2032 0500

Ffacs: 029 2032 0600

Ffôn testun: 029 2032 0660

E-bost: [post@archwilio.cymru](mailto:post@archwilio.cymru)

Gwefan: [www.archwilio.cymru](http://www.archwilio.cymru)