

Objectives/Priorities:	The purpose of the Good Home Alliance is to assist Lincolnshire residents to improve their homes by:
	1. Providing good quality information they can use themselves; and
	2. Providing extra advice and support for the most vulnerable.
	Objectives:
	1. To pilot and evaluate the Good Home Alliance Advice & Casework service
	2. Deliver a 2 year pilot to establish business case, identify demand and inform ongoing service delivery and operating model.

Risk rating	Low	Low level of risk on Council
	Medium	Risk mitigated by arrangement; some risk transference
	High	Substantial risk fall on council difficult to mitigate against risk

Option	Primary Option	Pros	Cons	Constraints: Legal; Skills sets; Resourcing; Health & Safety; Political	Risk Estimate to Council Operational and Financial	Likely to meet objectives & targets?	Recommend proceed to Outline/Full Business Plan	Comments
1	SELCP (ELDC) Hosted	<p>Line management for the existing Lincolnshire Healthy and Accessible Homes (Housing) Lead role is currently provided by the Strategic Housing Manager for the SELCP, in their capacity as chair of the Lincolnshire Healthy and Accessible Homes Group, accountable to the Lincolnshire Health and Housing Network and Housing, Health and Care Delivery Group.</p> <p>The Lincolnshire Healthy and Accessible Homes (Housing) Lead, hosted by BBC, will provide day-to-day line management responsibility for the Advice and Casework officers.</p> <p>Workforce management and HR systems are already will integrated between ELDC and BBC through the partnership, limiting operational management implications if hosted outside the Partnership.</p> <p>The Good Home Alliance project (inclusive of the Advice and Casework pilot) is accountable to the Lincolnshire Health, Housing and Care/Ageing Well Delivery Group (HHCDG). Chaired by Lincolnshire County Councillor and ELDC portfolio holder for Communities and Better Ageing. In addition to DC funding, LCC is also contributing £100k (21%) towards the total cost of the two year pilot.</p> <p>The SELCP represents 3 of the (up to) 7 funding councils, with ELDC funding 24% of the overall pilot funding; and the SELCP funding a combined 41%.</p> <p>Whilst jointly funded across the county, and accountable to all funding councils, hosting the pilot staffing within the SELCP provides an opportunity for the Partnership to lead on recruitment and operational management, delivery and performance of the team, and to ensure the day-to-day operations of the service deliver the identified objectives and outcomes for our residents.</p>	<p>Requires ELDC/SELCP to lead on recruitment of additional staffing to deliver the pilot.</p> <p>Operational day-to-day responsibilities will be held by ELDC e.g. information sharing, data protection, safeguarding etc.</p> <p>Potential perception issue that service delivery is responsibility of ELDC/SELCP only - requires robust communications</p> <p>Increases SELCP head count by 3-4 FTE and associated workforce operational requirements e.g. IT, HR, Payroll etc.)</p>	<p>Legal: None</p> <p>Skill sets: None. SELCP currently hosts and leads on the development of the GHA project.</p> <p>Resourcing: Requires evaluation, recruitment and on-boarding to up to 4 FTE.</p> <p>Political: Requires SELCP and ELDC approval HHCDG endorsement.</p>	<p>Operational: Medium. Operational responsibility for Advice and Casework service delivery will be held by ELDC on day to day basis, but governed by HHCDG</p> <p>Financial: Low. Position funding is being provided via LCC and funding Districts. No direct financial impact other than general operational requirements (e.g. IT, HR, Payroll etc.)</p>	Yes	Yes	Preferred option
2	LCC or other District Hosted	<p>Retaining operational responsibility for delivery of the pilot within the funding authorities (direct service delivery) increases the ability of the project steering group, governance and management to respond with agility as service requirements, needs and demands are established throughout the pilot period.</p> <p>Maintains connection and integration with DC hosted Energy Advice Demonstrator services, as part of wider GHA activities.</p> <p>Transfers operational risks and resourcing requirements from SELCP if the service is hosted within another Council.</p> <p>Does not require additional SELCP led recruitment or increase in FTE head count.</p> <p>Likely to increase accountability / engagement from a minor funding contributor and spread wider GHA project delivery accountability across funding partners.</p>	<p>Limits operational responsibility and control over delivery pilot if the positions and team hosted by minor funding contributor. Increases level of risk to SELCP as major funding contributor and ELDC as contributing most due to DFG allocation formula.</p> <p>Creates arms length management arrangements, between existing / incumbent SELCP lead positions: Healthy and Accessible Homes Housing Lead / Strategic Housing Manager.</p> <p>Dependent on alternative council appetite to host. Limited rationale for hosting with minor funding contributor, and/or potential limit to hosting Council's incentive to ensure successful delivery of pilot based on financial investment.</p> <p>Funding contributions are yet to be confirmed from all DCs - confirmation is not expected until January 2024 - risking delays to identification and agreement of alternative host authority.</p>	<p>Legal: None</p> <p>Skill sets: Current incumbent project leads sit within SELCP and would need to transfer existing operational knowledge requirements to identified hosting council.</p> <p>Resourcing: Reduces recruitment and operational resourcing requirements from SELCP/ELDC and transfers to alternative housing council.</p> <p>Political: Unknown council approval / political appetite. Potential delays / extended approval processes to engage and identify alternative hosting Council</p>	<p>Operational: Medium. Operational responsibility for Advice and Casework service delivery is transferred to alternative hosting council, however, direct day-to-day management, control and accountability for service performance is also transferred</p> <p>Financial: Medium. Combined, SELCP has the most financial investment at stake/incentive to ensure success of the service.</p>	Yes	Yes - if preferred option not endorsed.	Potential option - noting reduced SELCP control over pilot delivery and likelihood of delay to pilot recruitment and commencement of pilot.
3	Voluntary Sector Hosted	<p>Invests into local voluntary sector.</p> <p>Potential to leverage existing voluntary sector skills and community relationships.</p> <p>Reduced / outsourced direct operational pilot service management.</p>	<p>Unknown market capacity to provide service. Lack of market testing to support this option.</p> <p>Unclear commissioning/procurement lead and contracting arrangements - decision would be required.</p> <p>Potential to incur additional / unbudgeted 'pump priming' service development / commencement costs.</p> <p>Total service value of c.£500k would likely to require additional procurement processes, extend service commencement timeframes, and require additional approval processes. Current project timeframe and targets do not allow for this activity to be undertaken.</p> <p>Risks delaying engagement of Centre for Ageing Better (CfAB) evaluation and loss of access to identified CfAB evaluation funding.</p> <p>Difficult to define service delivery levels to outsource service, and limits flexibility to establish capacity requirements throughout pilot period. The pilot itself is intended to establish ongoing service levels, demand and delivery requirements / recommendations for transitioning service to ongoing operational delivery.</p> <p>Requires contact management resource and capacity - currently un-resourced. Risks pilot not achieving identified outcomes, or requires close contact management and project support. Limits project flexibility and adaptability or ability to respond to ongoing learning and evaluation to refocus pilot to meet identified outcomes.</p>	<p>Legal: TBC - possible procurement</p> <p>Skill sets: Unknown as to who would lead procurement. Unknown market / sector ability to deliver new / untested service offer.</p> <p>Resourcing: Unknown market capacity to deliver / unknown lead procurement capacity to resource. Unknown contract management capacity / resource</p> <p>Political: Unknown / unidentified council/Cllr appetite for externally provided service. Agreement potentially required by all funding councils.</p>	<p>Operational: High - procurement / provider engagement activities would require significant lead in times and unlikely to meet target service commencement dates in 2024 if option progresses.</p> <p>Financial: High - unknown service costs / tender requirements if provided by external provider. Costs could exceed available budget.</p>	No (due to the required market and procurement activities required to progressed within available timeframes)	No	Not recommended - likely to lead to significant project and service commencement delays
4	Wellbeing Service Hosted	<p>This option was initially considered by both LCC and the project group - and remains a preferred potential option for business as usual service delivery due to the synergy and alignment between the aims of objectives of the Advice and Casework Service and Wellbeing Service. However, due to the project timeframes and current re-commissioning of the Wellbeing Service, the option was unable to be progressed.</p> <p>The delivery of the pilot aims to establish the level of service demand, capacity, pathways and resources required, with the option to transition the ongoing service delivery into the Wellbeing Service once the new contract has commenced.</p> <p>Internal delivery of the pilot enables the full requirements to be established, defined and tested prior to recommending any ongoing service delivery model or incorporating any ongoing service provision into the Wellbeing Service, or alternative commissioned provider.</p>		<p>Legal: Wellbeing Service is currently being procured</p> <p>Skill sets: TBC</p> <p>Resourcing: TBC</p> <p>Political: TBC</p>	<p>Operational: TBC</p> <p>Financial: TBC</p>	Yes (but not at current time)	TBC dependent on pilot / evaluation and ongoing service delivery recommendations	Remains preferred potential option for post-pilot service delivery.

5	Do nothing	<p>The service/pilot is entirely discretionary with no requirement for SELCP or any other Council / organisation to provide.</p> <p>Not providing the Advice & Casework service would still meet one of the two objectives of the GHA - "to provide good quality information they can use themselves". However, limits ongoing resourcing for testing and maintenance of web based information and healthy home assessment.</p> <p>Does not require additional recruitment, resourcing or funding.</p>	<p>Does not meet the objective of the GHA to "provide extra advice and support for the most vulnerable"</p> <p>Does not meet the Lincolnshire housing needs, identified through the development activities and resulting from the CfAB Good Home Inquiry.</p> <p>Does not deliver against the strategic objectives of the HHCDG and Home for Independence delivery plan.</p> <p>Funding commitments are in progress across Lincolnshire County and District Councils</p>	<p>Legal: None</p> <p>Skill sets: Does not leverage existing skills / learning gained through project development</p> <p>Resourcing: Does not utilise identified resource / funding. Does not provide ongoing resource for testing and maintenance of Good Home Lincs web pages and Healthy Home Assessment.</p> <p>Political: Unlikely to be supported widely across funding Councils.</p>	<p>Operational: Medium</p> <p>Financial: Medium</p>	No	No	Not recommended
---	------------	--	--	---	---	----	----	-----------------

Council	Contribution	
Boston	£35,007	7%
East Lindsey	£112,844	24%
Lincoln City	£47,140	10%
North Kesteven	£50,379	11%
South Holland	£42,735	9%
South Kesteven	£53,962	12%
West Lindsey	£43,933	9%
Lincolnshire County Council	£100,000	21%
TOTAL	£468,000	100%