National Conditions

nfield			

The Spending Round established six national conditions for access to the Fund.

Please confirm by selecting 'Yes', 'No' or 'No - In Progress' against the relevant condition as to whether these have been met, as per your final BCF plan.

Further details on the conditions are specified below.

If 'No' or 'No - In Progress' is selected for any of the conditions please include an explanation as to why the condition was not met within the year (in-line with signed off plan) and how this is being addressed?

	Q4 Submission	Q1 Submission	Q2 Submission	Q3 Submission	Please Select (Yes	If the answer is 'No', please provide an explanation as to why the condition was not met within the year (in-
Condition	Response	Response	Response	Response	or No)	line with signed off plan) and how this is being addressed?
					Yes	
1) Are the plans still jointly agreed?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
					Yes	
2) Are Social Care Services (not spending) being protected?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
					Yes	
3) Are the 7 day services to support patients being discharged and prevent						
unnecessary admission at weekends in place and delivering?	Yes	Yes	No - In Progress	Yes		
4) In respect of data sharing - please confirm:						
					Yes	
i) Is the NHS Number being used as the primary identifier for health and care services?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
					Yes	
ii) Are you pursuing open APIs (i.e. systems that speak to each other)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
					Yes	
iii) Are the appropriate Information Governance controls in place for information						
sharing in line with Caldicott 2?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
5) Is a joint approach to assessments and care planning taking place and where					Yes	
funding is being used for integrated packages of care, is there an accountable						
professional?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
					Yes	
6) Is an agreement on the consequential impact of changes in the acute sector in						
place?	No - In Progress	Yes	Yes	Yes		

National conditions - Guidance

The Spending Round established six national conditions for access to the Fund:

1) Plans to be jointly agreed

The Better Care Fund Plan, covering a minimum of the pooled fund specified in the Spending Round, and potentially extending to the totality of the health and wellbeing Board area, should be signed off by the Health and Wellbeing Board itself, and by the constituent Councils and Clinical Commissioning Groups. In agreeing the plan, CCGs and councils should engage with all providers likely to be affected by the use of the fund in order to achieve the best outcomes for local people. They should develop a shared view of the future shape of services. This should include an assessment of future capacity and workforce requirements across the system. The implications for local providers should be set out clearly for Health and Wellbeing Boards so that their agreement for the deployment of the fund includes recognition of the service change consequences.

2) Protection for social care services (not spending)

Local areas must include an explanation of how local adult social care services will be protected within their plans. The definition of protecting services is to be agreed locally. It should be consistent with 2012 Department of Health guidance to NHS England on the funding transfer from the NHS to social care in 2013/14: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/213223/Funding-transfer-from-the-NHS-to-social-care-in-2013-14.pdf

3) As part of agreed local plans, 7-day services in health and social care to support patients being discharged and prevent unnecessary admissions at weekends

Local areas are asked to confirm how their plans will provide 7-day services to support patients being discharged and prevent unnecessary admissions at weekends. If they are not able to provide such plans, they must explain why. There will not be a nationally defined level of 7-day services to support patients are not discharged from hospital at weekends when they are clinically fit to be discharged because the supporting services are not available to facilitate it. The recent national review of urgent and emergency care sponsored by Sir Bruce Keogh for NHS England provided guidance on establishing effective 7-day services within existing resources.

4) Better data sharing between health and social care, based on the NHS number

The safe, secure sharing of data in the best interests of people who use care and support is essential to the provision of safe, seamless care. The use of the NHS number as a primary identifier is an important element of this, as is progress towards systems and processes that allow the safe and timely sharing of information. It is also vital that the right local areas should:

- confirm that they are using the NHS Number as the primary identifier for health and care services, and if they are not, when they plan to;
- confirm that they are pursuing open APIs (i.e. systems that speak to each other); and
- ensure they have the appropriate Information Governance controls in place for information sharing in line with Caldicott 2, and if not, when they plan for it to be in place.

NHS England has already produced guidance that relates to both of these areas. (It is recognised that progress on this issue will require the resolution of some Information Governance issues by DH).

5) Ensure a joint approach to assessments and care planning and ensure that, where funding is used for integrated packages of care, there will be an accountable professional

Local areas should identify which proportion of their population will be receiving case management and a lead accountable professional, and which proportions will be receiving self-management help - following the principles of person-centred care planning. Dementia services will be a particularly important priority for better integrated health and social care services, supported by accountable professionals. The Government has set out an ambition in the Mandate that GPs should be accountable for co-ordinating patient-centred care for older people and those with complex needs.

6) Agreement on the consequential impact of changes in the acute sector

Local areas should identify, provider-by-provider, what the impact will be in their local area, including if the impact goes beyond the acute sector. Assurance will also be sought on public and patient and service user engagement in this planning, as well as plans for political buy-in. Ministers have indicated that, in line with the Mandate requirements on achieving parity of esteem for mental health, plans must not have a negative impact on the level and quality of mental health services.

Footnotes

Source: For each of the condition questions which are pre-populated, the data is from the quarterly data collections previously returned by the HWB.