

THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA

FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –

10 SEPTEMBER 2012

REPORT BY ANDREW CHRISTIE, TRI – BOROUGH EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

TROUBLED FAMILIES – DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A TRI-BOROUGH APPROACH

REPORT FOR DISCUSSION

The report below summarises the proposed approach to delivering the Troubled Families Programme in the Tri- Borough and within the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. The Troubled Families programme was launched by the Prime Minister in December 2011 as one aspect of the Government's response to the disturbances in the summer of 2011. His ambition was to “turn around “the lives of 120,000 families characterised as families whose children were offending, excluded or not attending school and where parents were claiming out of work benefits.

The Department for Communities and Local Government announced the details of the Troubled Families programme in March. The programme is to be funded by a combination of attachments fees (like a grant) and Payment by Results. In July the Cabinet agreed to take a Tri- borough approach to delivering the programme in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. They agreed to the establishment of a single point of entry, known as Triage and the production of an intelligence report that would create a single view of the family and inform the programme of the interventions the family would require to meet the Government's desired outcomes.

The Cabinet Member is now considering the proposals for delivering the interventions.

1. REQUEST

The Committee is requested to consider the attached report, which is currently being considered for approval by the Cabinet Member for Family and Children's Services, Councillor Campbell, with a view to offering the Cabinet Member their recommendations on the proposals for implementation of the Troubled Families programme in the Tri-borough. The Committee are asked in particular to consider the following:

- The proposed 3 tier approach to delivery;
- The proposal to work across the tri-borough with a single Family Recovery triage and delivery offer with local interventions tailored to the local needs and strengths of each boroughs cohort and services;
- The extension of the use of the name Family Recovery to all the Troubled Families services across the Tri-borough with the ability for local teams to retain / use names acceptable to local members and partners for the existing service offer which is to be augmented to deliver Troubled Families interventions.

Natasha Bishopp
Tri-borough troubled Families Co-ordinator

John Page
Director of Family Services

Andrew Christie
Tri – borough Executive Director of Children’s Services

Tri-borough Executive Decision Report

[Note: For the purposes of the statutory record, this report will be accompanied by the relevant sign-off sheet used at each authority that is party to this decision. Such record will be retained at each such authority.]

Decision maker(s) at each authority and date of Cabinet meeting, Cabinet Member meeting or (in the case of individual Cabinet Member decisions) the earliest date the decision will be taken	<i>Insert Full Cabinet, Cabinet Member for X or Director for X as appropriate</i>	
	Date of decision: <i>[insert]</i>	
	Forward Plan reference: <i>[insert]</i>	
	<i>Insert Full Cabinet, Cabinet Member for Family and Children</i>	 THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA
	Date of decision: <i>20th September 2012</i>	
	Forward Plan reference:	
	<i>Insert Full Cabinet, Cabinet Member for X or Director for X as appropriate</i>	 City of Westminster
	Date of decision: <i>August 2012</i>	
	Forward Plan reference: <i>[insert]</i>	
Report title (decision subject)	TROUBLED FAMILIES – DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A TRI-BOROUGH APPROACH	
Reporting officer	Andrew Christie	
Key decision	Yes except for WCC	
Access to information classification	Public	
Cabinet Member or senior officer sign-off details	<i>[Report author to confirm that the authority of the relevant Cabinet Member at each authority has been obtained to the publication of this report – or Cabinet Member signature to be added below: Report authorised: [insert]</i>	

	<i>Date: [insert]</i>
--	-----------------------

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 In December 2011, the Government launched its programme to turn around the lives of the country's 120,000 most troubled families: those experiencing multiple problems and disadvantages such as unemployment, truancy and causing problems such as crime and anti-social behaviour at an annual estimated cost of £9 billion. The Government has estimated that there are 1720 Troubled Families in the Tri-borough local authorities that meet the criteria they have set, although this is before the data matching has been carried out to determine how many meet the criteria in reality.
- 2.2 The programme will run for three years funded by a combination of attachment fees and on a "payments by results" (PBR) basis to incentivise local authorities and other partners to prioritise this work.
- 2.3 Members have already approved the design principles for the Troubled Families intervention including agreeing to take a Tri-borough approach to delivery and to the establishment of a single triage and tracking unit.
- 2.4 This report updates Members on:
 - 2.4.1 the work which has been undertaken in identifying the Troubled Families in the Tri-borough according to the Government's criteria
 - 2.4.2 the specific proposals for delivering the interventions for the Troubled Families programme across the Tri- borough.

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 Cabinet Members for Children's services / Cabinet are requested to:

3.1.1 Approve the proposals for delivering the service.

4 REASONS FOR DECISION

4.1 The Troubled Families programme is an important new programme for the government and the Tri- borough Local Authorities and will require considerable annual expenditure. Although some of the spend is funded upfront by the government (in attachment fees); some may subsequently be recouped through 'payment by results'.

5 BACKGROUND, INCLUDING POLICY CONTEXT, AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

5.1 In December 2011 the Prime Minister announced additional funding for local government of £448 million over 3 years to turn around the lives of 120,000 Troubled Families in England. Troubled Families are a Government priority because of both the poor outcomes experienced by these families and their impact on the communities they live in, and because of the huge cost they impose on the public sector.

- 5.2 The DCLG Troubled Families offer is that if local authorities can intervene in the most troubled families and secure positive outcomes in terms of gaining employment, reducing youth offending and anti-social behaviour and improving educational attendance, they will receive a success payment. Authorities are expected to make their own investment in services that will ‘turn around the behaviour and lives’ of Troubled Families.
- 5.3 We have confirmed to (DCLG) that the three boroughs will establish a service that will:
- 5.3.1 oversee and account for successful engagement with Troubled Families in the area over the next 3 years, for which we will be eligible for funding.
 - 5.3.2 provide a figure of the number of families we aim to start working with within 2012-13 and the number of upfront attachment fees we will be claiming
 - 5.3.3 agree to work closely with European Social Fund (ESF) and work programme providers
 - 5.3.4 support and take part in research, learning and evaluation of the programme
 - 5.3.5 appoint a Troubled Families Co-ordinator to run the programme locally.
- 5.4 Tackling the issues surrounding Troubled Families is not new. We have undertaken a variety of programmes across the Tri-borough area in the last 4 years - Westminster’s Family Recovery Programme and Kensington and Chelsea’s Family Intervention Programme focus on a small number of the highest need, high cost families, and the Hammersmith and Fulham localities approach deals with a larger number of less high need families. There is ample evidence that these approaches work. However there have been insufficient funds to scale up provision to address the needs of all the families potentially in scope.

6 OPTIONS TO DELIVER SUSTAINABLE WORK WITH HIGH COST FAMILIES

- 6.1 Analysis has provided us with insights into the make-up of the Troubled Families Programme cohort; their needs and likely service requirements. It is important to note that the Troubled Families Programme cohort and a wider group of Families with Complex Needs are different and that there are varying degrees of need within each of the two cohorts. Some will simply need advice and signposting whilst others will have a complex network of support and have many unmet needs. There will therefore need to be a range of interventions to support these families – both to deliver the results to obtain the PBR and equally to enable families to make and sustain changes that improve their lives and reduce the demands, risks and costs to local and national public services.
- 6.2 The ‘cohort’ for the Troubled Families Programme is not homogenous. Not only do the ‘problems’ presenting vary in their degree and intensity within each family, but the main services who interact with the families vary (e.g. the Youth Offending Team, Children’s social care, Housing and Anti-Social Behaviour teams).

6.3 Design criteria

The steering group endorsed some design principles for the service offer:

That it should work with the grain of existing service delivery and support statutory services and not seek to replace it or create another delivery silo.

6.4 That it should maximise the opportunities for cross council and partner working and be able to flex to deal with any implications, maximising the opportunities from the Whole Place Community Budget (the Families and Justice themes in particular).

6.5 We agreed the service should be structured to: offer a triage/ assessment process (particularly in relation to the DCLG Troubled Families Cohort as it is likely that 75% are current statutory services clients, and additional services may not be appropriate or needed) to ensure that need is met in an proportionate way. We agreed the key features of the intervention (based on the RBKC Family Intervention Project (FIP) and WCC Family Recovery Project (FRP) should be: intensity and persistence; practical whole family support – e.g. housing, parenting coaching, substance misuse, domestic violence and mental / emotional distress, debt management, affordable childcare, referral to ‘family friendly’ employment support, interventions to prevent youth offending and anti-social behaviour; highly effective identification and monitoring systems – particularly the use of the intelligence desk; seamless support: access to relevant support which families respect: the community and voluntary sectors, mentors, restorative approaches, conflict resolution, education support. Finally, given the focus on the issues of offending, anti-social behaviour and non-school attendance, sanctions and rewards will be part of the offer, including the use of robust family agreements and strong monitoring and enforcement of persistent youth offending and ASB.

7 THE PROPOSED SERVICE DESIGN AND THE COMMUNITY BUDGET CONTEXT

7.1 The success of the Troubled Families Programme will be dependent on a range of agencies working collaboratively together: they will need to share local intelligence in order to identify the families and then re-shape and deliver co-ordinated services to the families. The key local partners are the three Councils (in particular Community Safety Teams, Children’s Services, Skills and Employment Services, Housing, Substance Misuse , Mental Health Services, Early Years and Childcare Services), Health (Public Health, Primary Care and Acute Services), the Metropolitan Police, Probation Service, Job Centre Plus, Reed Employment (providers of the DWP ESF provision), schools and voluntary sector organisations. They have been consulted throughout the design of the programme. The Community Budget team have been working on this aspect and preparing a case for government to sustain the PBR approach beyond the end of this programme.

7.2 The new service design

Each Troubled Families service offer will be based on the assessed needs of the family in relation to achieving the DCLG Troubled Families outcomes and turning their lives around. This will vary according to the families’ need and circumstances.

7.3 Triage

All troubled families who meet the criteria will be triaged. This will be undertaken by a single unit of police, local authority researchers and social work trained staff. They will

review the behaviour and needs of each family and make a recommendation about the service offer with a view to what interventions will be required to meet the desired outcomes and turn around the lives of the families. They will triage up to 600 families a year.

- 7.4 The service offer comprises three tiers with increasingly intensive services based on the complexity and risk presented by each family. It is proposed that the entire service will work under the umbrella term – Family Recovery but that each service will retain or develop a name that is locally acceptable. The advantages being: the term “Troubled Families” may not be an appealing one for families being recruited to the services; the Family Recovery Programme is an evidence based programme with significant “brand” recognition by central and local government partners; expanding the brand and developing the methods across the tri-borough and submitting them to rigorous evaluation will be advantageous in future lobbying and offer us an ability to compare the efficacy of the different local approaches against agreed metrics.
- A. Service delivered by the existing Children’s and Employment Services at no extra cost. E.g. the Locality Teams in Hammersmith and Fulham and Westminster and Early Help in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea; the Tri-borough Youth Offending Service; DWP/ESF Employment Programme for Families.
 - B. Medium intensity – a Family Coaching service offering intensive practical support to ensure families overcome a range of difficulties to get children back into school and reduce offending. This will complement the work of existing services.
 - C. High complexity service for high need families – where families require intensive co-located multi-agency intervention in addition to their core service. This will be provided by the FIP/ Adolescent Service in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and the Family Recovery Programme in Westminster, and may be commissioned by Hammersmith and Fulham from both.

The services will work to ensure that families understand the sanctions that could be imposed if parents fail to comply with some elements of the programmes. This will apply for some cases of unauthorised absence, child neglect, youth offending or anti-social behaviour. These are not new powers and in many cases have been available to services for a number of years. There is however transferable learning from the FIP and FRP in relation to improved outcomes for the families and the communities in which they live by better co-ordination between agencies working with the most complex families and the phased use of the sanctions.

- 7.5 In order to get this service underway within the very demanding timetable it is recommended that we commence a directly managed service. As the programme develops consideration will be given to opportunities to outsource.

7.6 Benefits

The single Tri-borough team that will carry out assessment, single care/ intervention plan, allocate resources and monitor, with service delivery through a wrap-around of the main service delivery, has the following benefits:

- 7.6.1 Opportunity to develop intelligence capacity across three boroughs, with an intelligence function, and opportunities to combine with MASH (Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub)
- 7.6.2 Opportunity for best practice to be shared across three boroughs
- 7.6.3 Efficient/ effective use of specialised resource including procurement and commissioning
- 7.6.4 Mitigates the PBR risk but maximized resource available
- 7.6.5 Enables the allocation of services and performance (and therefore the PBR) within each borough to be recognised, with money following success with individual families in individual boroughs, and charges for service usage
- 7.6.6 Ability to develop an evidence base of what works over time to drive better commissioning decisions, and develop sustainable investment mechanism
- 7.6.7 Ability to work with partners on the joint delivery of wrap around services
- 7.6.8 Ability to wrap around partner services (e.g. Registered Providers, GPs, ALMOs etc)
- 7.6.9 Potential to explore social investment for those outcomes paid for on a PBR basis.

- 7.7 There are a number of strategies which will be deployed to mitigate any risk of building in a dependence upon payment by results as follows:
 - 7.7.1 Plan the initial investment in additional Troubled Families provision on the basis of the average level of attachment fees, thereby enabling the actual progress in achieving payment by results (PBR) to determine any additional flexing up of investment
 - 7.7.2 Weight the provision of additional wrap around services to our in-house Family Intervention Programme in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, relevant Locality services in Hammersmith and Fulham and the Family Recovery Programme in Westminster where the scale of provision can be flexed up and down rapidly
 - 7.7.3 Continue to explore options for social investment for some sub-cohorts of Troubled Families, where the risk of PBR can be shared with an external investor.
 - 7.7.4 This delivery option is flexible in relation to finance. It allows accounting for individual Boroughs performance and therefore the success payments be accounted for on a borough basis. There is interest in social investment mechanisms for this cohort.
 - 7.7.5 A social impact bond is under development as a small scale pilot as part of the Hammersmith and Fulham White City Challenge Programme. It is targeted at families with multiple complex needs with children at risk of coming into care. The learning from this may be utilised in the development of the Troubled Families programme.

8 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed. There will be no direct or indirect impact on staff. By focusing on the most vulnerable families in the community who are likely to reflect the more disadvantaged minority groups the project is likely to have a positive impact on equality.

9 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no particular legal implications arising from this report.

10 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 Funding for this project is to be provided by the Government. The funding model is established over three years and authorities will receive a sum of money for each family they support. The payment is split between a guaranteed upfront payment (attachment fee) and a reward based that recognises the achievement of outcomes, should the family be supported to achieve the metrics set out elsewhere in this report. (Payment by Results). Although the total 'Successful Family Payment' is the same in each year (£4,000) the split between the two types of payment alters between the years, as set out below.

Successful Family Payment	Attachment Fee	Payment by Results	Total
Year1	£3,200	£800	£4,000
Year2	£2,400	£1,600	£4,000
Year3	£1,600	£2,400	£4,000

- 10.2 The total amount of money each authority receives will depend upon the number of families supported in their borough in any particular year. When developing a costed plan for the design and implementation of the new support procedures, consideration has been given to the total amount of funding available and given the risks associated in relying upon achieving payment by results prudent assumptions have been made as to the amount of available funding. The following table sets this out:

Year	Total Expected Cohort Volume (projected number of families we will receive funding for)	payment offered as attachment fee, £	Estimated Attachment Fee	Co-ordinator grant & Contributions in kind	Total TF Funding
1	416	3,200	1,331,200	£275,000	£1,606,200
2	770	2,400	1,848,000	£275,000	£2,123,000
3	167	1,600	267,200	£275,000	£542,200

Total	1353	7200		£825,000	£4,271,400
--------------	-------------	-------------	--	-----------------	-------------------

10.3 When developing an expenditure plan, whilst the total expenditure has been contained within the estimated total Troubled Families funding, the profile reflects where and when the resources need to be applied, not when the funding has been received. This is set out in the following table that shows the funding being received before it is applied, and carried forward in to years 2 and 3, with an expected underspend of £20,583 in total

Year	Total TF Funding	Estimated	In-Year Variance
1	£1,606,200	£653,000	£953,200
2	£2,123,000	£2,028,000	£95,000
3	£542,200	£1,569,817	-£1,027,617
Total	£4,271,400	£4,250,817	£20,583

10.4 The current model is based on prudent assumptions of funding but is still dependent on providing support to the expected number of families and ensuring that expenditure is kept in alignment. The project is set to run for three years and it is not expected that there will be any unaccounted residual expenditure at the end of this period.

10.4.1 Other Financial Considerations

10.4.2 Budget/funding arrangements

Budget/funding arrangements
The Tri-borough Troubled Families co-ordinator (Head of FRP WCC) is the budget holder.
The Troubled Families service will be fully funded externally by the Troubled Families' attachment fees and the Co-coordinator Grant. Funding has been secured for 3 years (2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15) and is dependent on the number of Troubled Families going through the Tri-borough programme.
A revenue budget will need to be created to match the external revenue grant.

10.4.3 Current/future costs

Current/future costs
The spend over the three years of the programme is profiled as follows:

	2012/13		2013/14		2014/15		Total costs		
REVENUE	Approved budget £'000	Proposal £'000	Variance £'000						
Costs	1,606	653	2,123	2,028	542	1,570	4,271	4,251	-20
External	-1,606	-1606	-2,123	-2,123	-542	-542	-4,271	-4,271	0

funding									
Charging income									
TOTAL	0	-953	0	-95	0	1,028	0	-20	-20

Table 1

Budget carry forward
The proposed budget carry forward, based on indicative costs and project funding totals is: £1.048m under-spend in 2012/13 and 2012/14 to offset an over-spend of £1.028m in 2014/15.

10.4.4 Savings, value for money

Savings, value for money
<i>Demonstrate how the proposal achieves savings and how these will be realised. Show other options considered and how the route chosen achieves best value for money.</i>
The interventions will be focused on a cohort who cost the council significant sums in relation to Looked After Children's care costs, anti-social behaviour enforcement and eviction. The hypothesis is that the interventions will impact on these outcomes as well as the CLG ones. The cohort will be tracked for impact on these wider benefits.
<i>Identify any risks and opportunities arising from the proposal and how these will be mitigated and exploited. Consider any optimism bias within the proposals and how customer behaviour/demand may be impacted.</i>
The PBR risks are mitigated by the budget only including the attachment fees which are more secure. The benefits of the programme will be agreed and tracked from the outset so that if elements are successful they can be extended or conversely decommissioned where they are not.

10.4.5 Other technical and commercial decisions

Other technical & commercial considerations
Are there any tax and accounting implications relating to this recommendation? If so, please explain. None
Are there any complexities around the commercial structuring of the project, e.g. loans, leases, asset ownership etc. Are there any unusual aspects, e.g. foreign currency payments? If so, please explain. None
For larger value items seek advice from your Business Partner on calculating cash flow, pay back periods and net present value of the proposals. Not applicable

11 CONSULTATION

Ward Members have not been consulted as the proposals are not ward specific at this stage. A comprehensive group of interested tri – borough statutory and provider organisations have been consulted. There has also been engagement with the two local neighbourhood community budget areas in White City and Queen’s Park.

12 Background Papers

- 12.1 Cabinet members’ briefing on Troubled Families for Tri– borough Children’s Services, April 2012
- 12.2 Cabinet member decision report, July 2012, Troubled Families - developing and implementing a Tri-borough approach
- 12.3 Evaluation of staff and parents’ experiences of the Westminster City Council ‘Work Focussed Services in Children’s Centres’ Pilot, completed in September and October 2010
- 12.4 Local Authority Child Poverty Innovation Pilots Evaluation: Final Synthesis Report, GHK Consulting/DfE, 2011
- 12.5 Making decisions about working in one-earner, couple households, Collard & Atkinson, 2009
- 12.6 Turning around the lives of families with multiple problems - an evaluation of the Family and Young Carer Pathfinders Programme, York Consulting, DFE.RB154
- 12.7 Process and outcome research on the Westminster Family Recovery Pathfinder, October 2011, June Thoburn, Neil Cooper, Sara Connolly and Marian Brandon. UEA
- 12.8 Understanding and tackling child poverty on Peabody estates, Feb 2012, Nicholas Pleace, David Rhodes and Deborah Quilgars, 2012
- 12.9 Analysis of needs and characteristics of Tri- Borough Troubled Families cohort. August 2012. C. O’Rourke.

13 Contact officer:

Natasha Bishopp. Head of Family Recovery, Westminster City Council and Tri-borough Troubled Families Co-ordinator. nbishopp@westminster.gov.uk. Tel - 07850 901779

14 APPENDIX 1: Other Implications

14.1 Business

Plan

In the Children's Services Tri-borough Strategic Business Plan 2012/13 DRAFTv1.3 Troubled Families is named as a key project in the business plan and it is matched against 5 of the 15 key priorities. These are: 2. Identify need early, 3. Resources, 4. Achieving potential (education), 8. Child poverty and 12. Lead active and purposeful lives. In addition it contributes significantly to the following: 9. Improve the health and wellbeing of children and young people, 10. Looked after children (by impacting on those on the edge of care), 14. Ensure all parents, children and young people have access to a range of high quality services, and 15. Work with our partners to reduce crime and antisocial behaviour and tackle serious youth violence and gang activity.

14.2 Risks and Issues

14.2.1 Risk Management

Ref	Risk "If.., then.." description	Mitigating actions	RAG impact on project deliverables RED – High Amber- medium Green – low
R1	If BAU does not own the opportunity it will be difficult to maintain referral numbers and drive through the savings from services from current services	Stakeholder have been listed and mapped, with further work planned on which key business managers in each borough need to be engaged. A communications plan is under development	A
R2	The new programme could identify greater levels of need than the Tri-borough has the capacity to serve.	Existing thresholds for current services will manage access to services. TF is an add-on, 'wrap around' to current services for families who meet the criteria and aims to harness current services more effectively for families that meet the criteria.	G
R3	The model may improve the service users' lives but not get them into work -	Conversations are taking place with	A

Ref	Risk "If..., then..." description	Mitigating actions	RAG impact on project deliverables RED – High Amber- medium Green – low
	because of the wider macro-economic context. Risk to the success of PBR model.	Greater Manchester to learn from the model they are using. Some outcomes are more easily impacted than others and this is why we have managed the impact of this risk on the TF budget by using the attachment fee to fund additional interventions and re-investing the PBR the following year.	
R4	Families' offending may not reduce because of factors outside both professional/family control e.g. increased criminal justice or police enforcement activity or legislative changes leading to greater number of arrests and convictions	There needs to be recognition that not all factors the TF intervention seeks to influence may be positively influenced. One of the functions of the Triage/ Information Desk is to provide a fuller picture to other agencies about family history and work being done with the family, and to monitor the effect of current interventions. If the family does not engage in change this may, for example, increase enforcement activity.	A
R8	ASB: without standardised recording and monitoring assumptions/methods across Tri-borough there is a risk of poor data leading to an inaccurate identification of target families and benefits to be realised.	Working with partners to agree standardisation of reporting. ASB referral pathways to be agreed with all relevant Tri-borough stakeholders prior to go live, including detailed criteria and monitoring	A

Ref	Risk "If..., then..." description	Mitigating actions	RAG impact on project deliverables RED – High Amber- medium Green – low
		methods. These are to be signed off by the project board as appropriate for auditing purposes. First task is to identify relevant stakeholders through the Triage communications strand.	
R9	If not enough families are identified to enable the business case to be viable then there will be insufficient attachment fees to fund the programme	Flex size of teams up or down to manage this.	A

14.2.2 Issues

No.	Issue	Mitigation	RAG impact on project deliverables RED – High Amber- medium Green – low or nil
I1	Delay in getting data from DWP. H&F data was delayed a number of weeks.	This has impacted upon timescales but every effort is being made to recover lost time which should minimise impact	R
I3	Access to IT – need access to multiple systems in a co-located area	A work around has been found where data exists on systems. There is an ongoing issue re records	G
I4	Ability to recruit quality staff at short notice: staffing / training / capacity implications – need skilled staff at short notice to be able to interrogate systems and assess cases	Propose to deliver project in-house initially and build on our expertise	G

No.	Issue	Mitigation	RAG impact on project deliverables RED – High Amber- medium Green – low or nil
15	Additional resources – e.g. police and job centre plus required to set up Triage	Request made via MASH and CDRPs for this resource.	A
16	Case recording system – ability to monitor / evidence outcomes and case record	Agreed with partners to use SharePoint (tried and tested in FRP) in the short term, and to look for an alternative in the longer term	G
17	The agency that delivers the delivers the savings will only receive a small portion of the benefit. The CB single conversation piece with Greater Manchester and Whitehall is concerned with finding a national way forward on this	The CB single conversation piece with Greater Manchester and Whitehall is concerned with finding a national way forward on this	R

14.3 Health and Wellbeing, including Health and Safety Implications – the use of the triage intelligence function should promote both worker and client safety by providing an up to date picture of risk of violence.

14.4 Crime and Disorder

The programme specifically seeks to address young offenders and if successful will contribute to a reduction in re- offending by young people under 18 years. In addition it seeks to address anti –social behaviour by families in relation to their neighbours.

14.5 Staffing

The Tri- Borough may need to employ up to 25 staff to deliver both the Information / Triage element and a large part of the intervention element of the programme. All staff contracts will be time limited to the duration of the programme. Redeployees will be given first consideration for any of the roles created. The budget will include an allowance for redundancy should it be required at the end of the programme.

14.6 Human Rights

There are no implications for human rights.

14.7 Impact on the Environment

There are no implications for the Environment.

14.8 Energy measure issues

There are no implications for the Energy measurement.

14.9 Sustainability

14.10 Communications

As the programme goes live, there will be communication considerations in relation to government, members, local residents, service users and stakeholders. A plan is under development.

15 Appendix 2: Definition of a Troubled Family

- 15.1 DCLG wrote to all local authorities setting out the number of Troubled Families they estimated to be living in each area. Across the Tri-borough they estimated there were 1720 Troubled Families (Westminster - 780 families, LBHF - 540 and RBKC - 400). To qualify for a payment a 'Troubled Family' must meet 3 of the 4 following criteria:
- 15.1.1 Crime/Anti-Social Behaviour: the family contains one or more 18 year olds or under with a proven offence in the last 12 months AND/ OR one or more member has an ASBO, ASB Injunction, Acceptable Behaviour Contract or the family has been subject to a housing related ASB intervention in the last 12 months;
 - 15.1.2 School truancy/exclusion: A child has been subject to permanent exclusion; three or more fixed school exclusions in the last three consecutive terms; OR; is in a Pupil Referral Unit or alternative provision because they have previously been excluded; OR is not on a school roll AND/ OR a child has had 15% unauthorised absences or more from school in the last three consecutive terms;
 - 15.1.3 Unemployed: household has an adult on working age benefits (ESA, IB, Carers Allowance, Income Support and/ or Jobseekers Allowance);
 - 15.1.4 Local discretion: to add other families who meet any two of the three criteria above AND are a cause for concern e.g. a child on the edge of care ,with a Child Protection Plan or living with Domestic Violence, parental Drugs or alcohol abuse or parental mental health issues.

16 Appendix 3: The Financial Deal from DCLG

- 16.1 Upfront monies have been made available for capacity building, through the appointment of a Troubled Families coordinator. In addition DCLG are offering a maximum payment of £4000 for every family successfully 'turned around'. This is a mixture of Attachment Fee and a success payment. The balance of Attachment Fee to PBR payment varies over the three years of the Programme. In the first year the payment is 80% Attachment Fee, with DCLG recognizing that local authorities will take time to re-design/scale up services. By year three however, 60% of the payment is on success through PBR.
- 16.2 The results for which DCLG will pay are:

16.2.1 Offending/ASB reduced AND school attendance improves – £3,900 per family;

16.2.2 Referral to a DWP European Social Fund provider - £100 per family; OR

16.2.3 At least one adult has moved off working age benefits into continuous unemployment - £4000.

16.3 To reflect the difficulty that local authorities face, the Government has structured their offer so that there is a guaranteed attachment fee and an outcome fee based on the successful achievement of results. This is managed over the three years by a sliding scale with greater emphasis on results as set out below:

Successful Family Payment	Attachment Fee	Payment by Results	Total
Year1	£3,200	£800	£4,000
Year2	£2,400	£1,600	£4,000
Year3	£1,600	£2,400	£4,000

16.4 The Government is seeking a commitment across the three boroughs to oversee and account for successful engagement with up to 1,720 Troubled Families over the next 3 years, 1,441 of which are eligible for funding from within the payment-by-results element of this programme. The eligibility criteria are based on the presumption that existing targeted funding e.g. European Social Fund employment programme for families is already available to support 1/6 of the identified Troubled Families.

16.5 The breakdown of families across the three boroughs is set out below and includes the total available funding over the three years should the service be successful in ensuring that all families met the targets set. The total level of funding for the next three years could be as much as £5.76m across the Tri-borough, subject to achievement of results.

	Target No of Troubled Families	Eligible Number	Total over 3 years.
Hammersmith & Fulham	540	450	£1,800,000
Kensington & Chelsea	400	333	£1,332,000
Westminster	780	658	£2,632,000
	1,720	1,441	£5,764,000

16.6 The Financial framework requires authorities to predict the numbers of families they will support in 2012/13 and therefore the number of upfront attachment fees. As a guide the Government has budgeted for a third of the 120,000 Troubled Families nationally to be worked with in 2012/13 though they encourage authorities not to be restricted in their plans by that assumption. The following table sets out an exemplification of the funding available in 2012/13 based on the assumption that the number of Troubled Families are supported in equal numbers over the three year period.

2012/13	Troubled Families	Eligible Number	Attachment	PBR	Total
Hammersmith & Fulham	180	150	£480,000	£120,000	£600,000
Kensington & Chelsea	133	111	£355,200	£88,800	£444,000
Westminster	263	219	£701,867	£175,467	£877,000
	577	480	£1,537,067	£384,267	£1,921,333

16.7 Whilst the same level of funding is available over the three year period it is important to appreciate that the gearing will change so that by 2014/15 the differential between the amount of attachment fee and payment by results will have altered significantly. It is essential to realise that this total level of funding is only available if all of the eligible families are supported in the programme to achieve the reported targets.