

Appendix A – Completed template evaluating the options against the proposed outcomes criteria

Option	Strengths	Weaknesses
1	<p>Targeted commissioning addresses unmet need / increases choice / potential to improve outcomes and address blockages.</p> <p>Could address each partners commissioning priorities (dementia nursing, reablement or respite as examples)</p> <p>Potential for positive financial impacts in short term if nursing services can be re-shaped. May depend on FNC / CHC arrangements and funding formulas.</p> <p>Possibility of savings to LAs (less likely for Health).</p> <p>Where savings are achievable more likely to occur in longer term via process/structure changes required to achieve full pooled fund (e.g. via specialised or centralised commissioning functions).</p> <p>Gradual approach allows time to develop solutions to sustainability and resilience problems. May allow for re-investment of any efficiency savings. May allow reshaping of nursing services to address nursing shortfalls.</p> <p>A staged approach is more practical to achieve. It allows for planning needed to achieve incremental change.</p> <p>Staged approach minimises financial risks and allows time to</p>	<p>May create extra work without satisfying WG.</p> <p>Does not lead to any other systems /process, structure or service changes – no commissioning benefits in the short term.</p> <p>Less opportunity to plan to realise benefits potentially available from full pooled funds.</p> <p>Delaying full pooled fund may not be acceptable to WG.</p> <p>Delaying may not achieve financial savings quickly enough.</p> <p>Delaying will reduce opportunity for faster change to systems/processes, structure and services.</p> <p>Detailed analysis of expenditure and placement patterns may highlight need for additional financial contributions from individual parties.</p>

	<p>develop governance arrangements designed to manage risks associated with full pooled fund</p> <p>Creates trust between partners by developing arrangements slowly / requiring commitments gradually</p> <p>Is more deliverable in this sense.</p> <p>Transactional approach is seen by some as more likely to meet WG requirements (e.g. West Wales and Cardiff and Vale)</p>	
2	<p>Leads to actual pooled budget during 2nd year (meets requirements of Part 9 and acceptable to WG)</p> <p>Opportunity for efficiency savings as soon as 2nd year.</p> <p>Stepped approach to achieving services changes.</p> <p>Enables each partner to maintain autonomy over all other systems, processes, functions, structures etc.</p>	<p>No service improvements initially.</p> <p>Some opportunity costs associated with new payment arrangements (project management / other start-up costs).</p> <p>Information management systems required to reconcile payments with placements.</p> <p>Possible workforce impacts (legal and political issues?)</p>
3	<p>Achieves part 9 obligations.</p> <p>If funding formulas could be agreed quickly may lead to financial contributions which more accurately reflect each partner's liabilities.</p> <p>Radical change may offer potential for biggest gains.</p>	<p>Radical change poses biggest risks (financial, political, workforce, deliverability, market stability etc.).</p> <p>Radical change will generate most resistance.</p> <p>Timescales allow for very little preparation.</p> <p>At this stage partners do not have a full understanding of the nature and magnitude of change that is required.</p>