OFFICER DECISION RECORD	
Decision Maker:	Helen Charlesworth-May
Date:	30.03.2022
Title:	Assistive Technology Service
Decision:	Cheshire East Council to award contract to the following provider for the provision of the Assistive Technology Service • Millbrook Healthcare Group Ltd (Trading as Ross Care)
Significant Decision?	No
Report From:	Position: Senior Commissioning Manager
	Contact Name: Nik Darwin
	Telephone: 07500 101232
	Email: nik.darwin@cheshireeast.gov.uk
Authority:	This record relates to an officer decision taken as quoted below: Adult and Health Committee agreed the following recommendation in the Committee Paper (September 2021) that it: o delegates authority to the Director of Commissioning to award the contract(s) subject to approval being given to a report being brought to committee, once the consultation and engagement process around the Assistive Technology recommission has been completed. Adult and Health Committee agreed the following recommendation in the Committee Paper (November 2021) that: o the details provided of the revised model for the Assistive Tehcnology Service be noted.
Consultee(s):	Councillor Jill Rhodes
Conflicts of	Conflicts of interest declared by the decision maker:
Interest:	Conflicts of interest declared by Consultee(s):
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	No

Legal Input:	I am satisfied that the decision is supportable.
	Adrian Leslie - Lawyer Contracts & Procurement Team
	adrian.Leslie@cheshireeast.gov.uk
	Re-dated 12/12/25
Finance Input:	Please seek financial advice from the appropriate Finance Contact*3 before seeking approval from the Consultees. This should cover costs, budget provisions or funding source utilised, and any other financial consequences The total contract value is £4,778,057.76 over 6 years. The annual value is estimated to be £796,342.96 (estimated as this is an activity based contract). The contract term is 4 years (with the option of 2 further 1 year extensions),
	I am satisfied that the recommended option is supportable based on the estimated annual spend provided by Commissioners.
	The Telecare contract is funded by the BCF and the budget value is £757k pa.
	The new contract is estimated to be slightly above this budget value, however it is significantly lower than the current contract which is costing around £1.2m pa, so this is a significant reduction in the pressure and will provider greater VFM.
	There is also the flexibility in the BCF to fund overspends by up to 10%. Applying this would then mean that the costs would be full covered by the BCF up to a maximum of £833k pa, provided that there is sufficient underspend on other BCF schemes to allow it. Prior years BCF's suggest that this is likely to be possible as there is generally a carried forward balance on the BCF each year end.
	Nikki Wood-Hill 24.03.22
Signed:	111 60 4
[Officer title]	Much Carly
	Helen Charlesworth-May – Executive Director 30 March 2022
Signed:	
[Consultee title]	
Signed:	
[Consultee title]	
Signed:	
[Consultee title]	

OFFICER DECISION RECORD

1. THE DECISION:

Cheshire East Council to award contract to the following provider for the provision of the Assistive Technology Service

Millbrook Healthcare Group Ltd (Trading as Ross Care)

2. REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

A compliant procurement process has been undertaken and bids were received from 3 Providers in total. Providers had to provide information for the "form of tender" and "certificate of non-collusion and non-canvassing documentation" sections. As a result of this process, 'Millbrook Healthcare Group Ltd (Trading as Ross Care)' was successful in the tender process.

3. DETAILS OF ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED:

Assistive Technology plays an important role in ensuring that the Council meets its statutory duties under the Care Act and also supports the choice and control of service users thereby increasing their independence.

Extensive work was undertaken to explore the business case for differing models of provision which established this was the approach which maximised service quality and value for money.

4. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Assistive Technology (also known as Telecare) is an umbrella term to describe a range of electronic devices which can support someone in their home and in their local community. This includes devices such as pendant alarms (involving a button an individual can press when they need help), falls detectors (which automatically send an alert when a fall is sensed) to bed and chair sensors which identify when an individual has decided to stand. These function in conjunction with a call centre and mobile response team to monitor and protect individuals.

The recommissioning of this service with a revised model is built on learning from the last three years. The approach aligns with the priority within the Corporate Plan of; "A Council which empowers and cares about people". This was developed from extensive work including: review of current service provision, engagement with stakeholders (including current users), and research over market changes. This enables the Council to meet its duties under the Care Act.

5. [IN CASE OF URGENT DECISIONS —DETAILS OF CONSULTATION WITH RELEVANT COMMITTEE MEMBERS—AND THE DATE OF THE NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING AT WHICH THE DECISION WILL BE REPORTED]

*1 Significant Decisions

The rules relating to significant decisions are set out in the Constitution under Access to Information Procedure Rules (Chapter 3 Part 2).

Paragraphs 26 and 27 require that a Forward Plan be prepared containing matters which the committee chairs have reason to believe will be significant decisions to be taken by a committee or sub-committee during the period covered by the plan.

Paragraph 27.2 states that where the decision taker is an individual, his/her name and title shall be included in the Forward Plan.

Paragraph 29 states that: 'As soon as reasonably practicable after any decision has been made by an officer, he/she will prepare, or instruct the Proper Officer to prepare, a record of the decision, a statement of the reasons for it and any alternative options considered and rejected. Significant decisions made by Officers will also be open to inspection.'

NOTE: Significant decisions are not, merely by virtue of their significance, subject to referral.

Only decisions taken by committees/sub-committees or under a specific delegation to officers, whether significant or not, are subject to referral.

*2 Referral of Decisions

The Constitution (Chapter 3: Part 1—Section 2) paragraphs 4.19 to 4.25 sets out the procedure for Referrals of Decisions.

These rules apply to decisions taken by a service committee or by an officer with a specific delegated authority from a service committee.

Under this procedure, any decision specifically delegated to an officer can be the subject of a referral request.

It is the source of the authority for the decision rather than its significance that is relevant under this procedure.

Where a decision is the subject of a specific delegation and therefore subject to referral, that decision will not be implemented, until the expiry of 5 clear working days after the decision was made and recorded.

NOTE: A significant decision taken by an officer under powers contained in the scheme of delegation would not be subject to referral.

*3 Contributors

Whilst the report author (Service) provides the content of the report, in all cases legal and finance advice MUST be provided by an officer from Legal and Finance.

The report author may also wish to include input from other enabling services which can be included in page 2.